WOMEN AND WORLD FEDERATION

BOOKS BY MRS. TUTTLE

THE AWAKENING OF WOMEN

Essays upon the spiritual
aspects of feminism

GIVE MY LOVE TO MARIA

A book of short stories

WOMEN AND WORLD FEDERATION

By
FLORENCE GUERTIN TUTTLE

"Of all the war aims none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war"
British Labor Party

NEW YORK
ROBERT M. McBRIDE & CO.
1919

Printed in the United States of America

PUBLISHED JULY, 1919

TO MY MOTHER

Lucy Flint Henry Guertin

who taught me that liberty, equality and fraternity would some day include all peoples—even women—and that woman's responsibility began, but did not end, at home.

FOREWORD

I agree with Mrs. Tuttle's message that women must help end war, and that they may do it effectively by getting behind the League of Nations organization to make war as improbable as possible and by loyally supporting the League and urging its adoption by this country, and particularly in the Senate of the United States. I sincerely hope that Mrs. Tuttle's book will help to concentrate the public opinion of the women of the country and lead the Senate to realize the weight of public sentiment in favor of this great instrumentality for peace.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

APPENDIX.

"Among the soldiers of the French army, as well as among those of the British army, there was, from the beginning, a sense of despair that civilization itself should have been dragged down to such depths of degradation in the filth of the battlefields with their wholesale slaughter of youth and of life's beauty and decency. Their hatred of the Germans who were the direct cause of this did not blind them to the larger truth that *the whole structure and philosophy of Europe had been damnably guilty* and that *if* it had been different — O God, in some way different! not even the Germans would or could have let the devils loose upon the boyhood of the nation and upon women and children.

"Over and over again in the early days French officers and men said to me with a thrill of passion in their voices: 'If I thought this Thing would ever happen again I would strangle my child in its cradle to save it from torture'. This was said to me not once, nor dozens, nor scores of times, by bloody and bandaged men, but hundreds of times. It was the common, general, passionate thought. — Young English officers of good families argued passionately in the face of death that *all our social structure was wrong* (the italics are mine) and that there would be no hope for humanity for which they were going to die — they knew that — unless *some new relationship between nations could be established.*

—Philip Gibbs: *New York Times,* March 7th.

INTRODUCTION.

A YOUNG soldier, recently returned from France, to whom I had been speaking of women and world peace, said: "Men will read your book but not women. I have been home three months and I have heard but one woman mention a League of Nations."

It may be true that women in the aggregate are not interested in world organization. But I believe that women will read a book on a league of nations written by a woman to women, if they realize that to organize the unity of mankind is the way, and the only way, to safeguard human life. Three reasons offer me foundation for this belief. First, in many states women are now one-half the electorate, and are therefore politically responsible for the fate of a League of Nations. Second, owing to the exhaustion of man-power in Europe, women will have to help carry on the torch of progress as they have never helped before. And in the third place, women were never so free to be interested and so fitted to contribute to social creativeness as to-day.

We have only to pause and consider the relative effects of the war upon men and women as a

whole to recognize the authority for this belief. We have heard frequent complaints of the paucity of ideas at Versailles and in Europe generally to cope with new and acute situations. And why not? Europe has been decimated of its masculine creative potentialities. The creative forces cannot function except through the individual center, and these individual centers, in appalling numbers, have been swept away. Six million soldiers killed upon battlefields; eighteen million crippled and mutilated, and as many again destroyed by accident or disease!

Consider, on the other hand, the effect of participation in war activities for four years upon the lives of women. It broke every shackle of tradition that had obstinately remained unbroken. It freed their energies, liberated their minds and trained their activities as they had never been liberated and trained in the history of the world. Every war has had this emancipating effect upon women, the necessities of the hour pushing them out of the cloister into the open, out of the strictly feminine into the human, although the instrument of their liberation has been retrogressive and inhuman. Finally the war has deprived countless women of husbands, everywhere, leaving them free to contribute to social problems as they might otherwise not be free.

If it be true that women are not interested in a League of Nations, I believe that it is partly because no special attempt has been made to interest

them. The wishes of many forward-looking women to build the aspirations of women into the Peace Treaty and League Covenant at Paris were ignored. A librarian recently told me that this same negligence to relate this great subject to the interests of women ran through the three hundred or more books she had catalogued on international organization. Moreover, although there were many books on sovereignty, nationality, economics and all the varying phases of world organization, there was no simple, comprehensive book, giving the subject as a whole, that she could give to busy women and say, "Here is the why and the how of democratic world organization. It's your task as well as your brother's." So I determined to try, however imperfectly, to write such a volume for women too absorbed in office or home to read widely on this subject, themselves, but who still, I knew, were intensely interested.

Forty different plans for world unity were submitted to the Paris Conference — every kind of a League of Nations, except a Woman's League.

This book is an effort to sketch briefly the necessary outlines of world guarantees from the woman's point of view, outlines to work towards, through the Paris Covenant. For whatever its faults, we have here at least the germ of world union to be moulded into the Democratic ideal.

The book has for its guiding principle that a League, to be efficacious, must eliminate the

historic causes of war, and that to be pragmatic it must be a human covenant working through the political and economic instrument to protect the world's common interests.

It holds that if the covenant that has already been created is not the chart humanity may safely sail by, then women must help make it a safe chart. If it is not a human instrument for safeguarding life, women must help amend it as the Constitution of the United States has been amended, until it become a human instrument for guarding life. It it be a League of privilege, a League for politicians and not a League for peoples, women must help make it a League for peoples since women are (almost) people in the leading democracies of the world.

I realize that I have tried to cover a wide surface, and that from a political, economic, or even a literary point of view diffusion may be dangerous. The only failure, however, that could really count would be a failure to convince women that world peace is equally woman's work; that if the world is ever again turned into a slaughterhouse, women will be equally responsible with men, and that the only way to secure a new world order is through supporting a new instrument that will make the guarding of our common humanity a common world task.

F. G. T.

Bellport, Long Island, N. Y.

Chapter I.

WOMEN AND A DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this." Esther 4: 14.

A PEACE Congress can create a League of Nations but it cannot create permanent peace. That is a task for "all of us," men, women and children, especially women, for generations to come.

The League of Nations is on trial for its life. If it fail to work, it will be not because the plan lacks the elements of success, but because we of little faith have not demanded of ourselves that it succeed. If it fail to stimulate public enthusiasm, it will be largely, I believe, because no effort has been made to enlist the interest of women.

At first glance, it would seems as if the launching of a League of Nations, like the waging of war, were man's work, but on second thought it is seen to lay the weight of its responsibility upon women as well. It contains the one war aim in which all true women are most interested: that there shall be no more war. It holds the future of women and children in its scope and will decide

whether life is to become sweet and wholesome again or remain recurrently threatened. Moreover, the waging of war may no longer be said to be man's work, alone, since millions of women participated in it. Mr. Asquith has repeatedly said that the war could not have been pursued in Great Britain without the sustained assistance of women, and Lloyd George at the Inter-allied Women's Congress in Paris, in 1918, paid them a like tribute, adding: "The authors of this war could not have foreseen that one of its main effects would be to give women a commanding position and influence in the public affairs of the world. . . .

"To their ennobling influence we look not only for strength to win the war, but for inspiration during the great work of reconstruction we will have to undertake after victory is won."

All present-day wars depend largely upon industrial efficiency impossible without the co-operation of women. It is difficult, therefore, to see how the cables of a lasting peace may be laid without their co-operation. Such a peace never has been established by man in his upward journey of six thousand years, and in all probability never may be established by him, alone. His inherited characteristics and traditions are too strongly against it.

Man has tried gloriously to inaugurate permanent peace and gloriously has failed. He tried after the Napoleonic ambition had devastated

Europe when Alexander of Russia — that land of frustrated ideals — dreamed of a united world. But the Holy alliance — instituted by the rulers of Russia, Austria and Prussia in 1815, and signed by most of the sovereigns of Europe — falling between church and state, degenerated into a trust of monarchs, surely a warning to Imperialism in the establishment of a League of Nations to-day. Man's nearest approach to protracted peace is to be found in the one hundred years of the cessation of warfare between England and America, a period in which each country made its most substantial progress. Incidentally, it should be noted, in both these countries, the woman movement was most advanced and disturbing.

The Holy Roman Empire endured for over two hundred years, but it was not a league of *free* nations, and it was maintained by the sword.

In all probability, wars will never cease until liberated women, in large numbers, join liberated men in demanding that they shall cease; demand and go out and work for their demand just as they organized and went out and worked to gain suffrage. Political changes do not come easily. They are the result of agitation, organization and constructive propaganda. In public affairs above all else, we get what we go out for, through the medium of an organized public opinion.

It is important for women to recognize that everything that could be said against war has been

said, applauded and ultimately ignored. But not everything has been done to check war and almost nothing has been attempted collectively. The Hague Tribunal failed — if what has never been tried may be said to have failed — for lack of authority to enforce its decisions, and because Germany, a country industrially forward but politically backward, refused to sign the treaties. Peace has been left to the fortuitous waves of chance, as we have left nothing else. In an age of organization we have organized everything except that which is most dear. In all probability, permanent peace will not dawn until, as we have said, advanced women add their power to that of advanced men and organize the spiritual and material forces of the world, for permanent peace. Men cannot accomplish this giant task alone any more than women could accomplish it alone. But men and women, working together and pooling their vision, may have any kind of world that they desire. The great thing is to know what kind of a world they wish to construct — what kind of a world the acute crisis of civilization demands.

Once, when the influence of women in government was nil, the proposition that women should end wars would have been highly humorous. To-day, with the governments of belligerent countries enfranchising women in large numbers — and without the tradition of war to stimulate them, or the fetish that national honor may be

appeased only by blood sacrifice to influence them — women may practically affect the pathway of peace. At any time they may turn the tide of progress. The chief obstacle that prevents is their own unawareness of power — a lack not only of political consciousness, but also of a high and compelling sense of obligation to the race they so largely create. In spite of this, a stalwart fact of the future seems to be that the political balance of governments in the days to come may lie in the hands of women, and that if they honestly desire universal peace, and combine and organize for peace — permanent world peace may not be a will-o'-the-wisp.

Many privileged women, glimpsing this truth, have been sustained in their work in the long conflict by the thought that they were in reality engaged in a war to end war itself. "Never again" has been the refrain that has sung itself to the rhythm of wheel and shuttle as women, having lost all that makes life dear, with breaking hearts toiled on. And this unsung song has not only echoed in the minds of women, but also in the hearts of brave men even in the trenches, where it has reverberated, like an exultant funeral dirge above the shock of shell.

To-day, with the German sword broken at our feet, there is a plan spreading a message of cheer like a rainbow over a blood-soaked earth, to make such a hope among men and women something

else than a phantom. The idea of establishing a Democratic League of Nations, not only to prevent war, but also, what is far more essential, to organize the world's economic and political forces that the causes of war may be lessened and peace itself may be ordered and regulated — is, according to H. G. Wells, "the most creative and hopeful of political ideas that has ever dawned upon the consciousness of mankind. . . . Not to be making it more widely known and better understood, not to be working out its problems and bringing it about, is to be living outside of the contemporary life of the world. For a book upon any other subject at the present time some apology may be necessary, but a book upon this subject is as natural a thing to produce now as a pair of skates in winter when the ice begins to bear."

To gaze for the first time upon the possiblities of a Federated World is almost to hide one's face with awe. To comprehend it in its far-reaching entirety is to feel as Keats felt when he first read Chapman's Homer:

"Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken;
Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
He stared at the Pacific. . . ."

What is this far-reaching plan that must eventually co-ordinate the nations and penalize the

passions of men? Briefly, the ideal is to organize the intricate, interlacing activities of Mankind into a common covenant of power, supervised and regulated by a central authority that will relieve and regulate the economic and political pressure that now leads to war. Its chief aim is that nations may have an opportunity to *change* — that most urgent law of life for which no international machinery is now provided — without recourse to the backward method of war. It distinctly does not aim to control the internal mechanism of the State, but does aim to regulate its external relations. Each state must retain its characteristics and individual existence at the same time that it bows, in matters affecting the common welfare of the world, to the common good — as New York retains her distinction but bows to Washington in matters that affect the Union. The League is to be centered in Geneva, Switzerland, and is to establish a permanent Court of International Justice. Dissatisfied Nations may take their growing needs to this World Court as corporations now take their difficulties to federal courts. If a state refuses to abide by the decision of the Court, it is to be subjected to economic segregations and sanctions. If it still be obdurate, considering its individual ambition rather than the collective advantage, and become militant, it may be moved upon and disciplined by the unified force of the world.

Before the great surrender, it was suggested in

certain quarters of the United States that until victory was actually won we should not allow ourselves time to think constructively of the future; but that was not the attitude of our Allies. In England it seemed to be understood that military victory itself depended largely upon underlying political sagacity. In England, there were over one hundred commissions working upon after-the-war problems. In London and Dublin there were active League of Nations societies, publishing pamphlets and conducting propaganda. But in America, except in the League to Enforce Peace, fostered by Mr. Taft, the American public was curiously indifferent. In time of war prepare for peace was treated as a sentiment almost of rank sedition. Fortunately, this was not Mr. Lloyd George's attitude. Repeatedly he expressed his opinion, unmistakably, as to the propriety of looking beyond the smoke of battle: "We have suffered in war, perhaps, through lack of preparation before we entered it. Do not let us make the same mistake in peace," he said in July. The things that we will do now will be more permanent, he told us. If the world is not poured into a right mould now, while it is in a molten state, "it will cool down very quickly, and the shape which you give it will remain. And if your mould is not the right one, you cannot possibly set things right without another convulsion that will break it."

To say that this great ideal of ending war is

too complex to succeed, should be dismissed as unworthy. It is far more complicated not to have it. All federations have been complex, so overwhelmingly difficult that only the direst necessity has brought them reluctantly to fruition, and the doubters have almost swamped the new craft before it set sail! Our fathers, for example, before the American federation, discussed for months one point alone — the question of state rights. After one hundred years of success, the Senate has until recently been discussing this question of which measures belong to the state and which to the federated government on a principle that should be a fundamental of democracy: the enfranchisement of women. The question of swarming nationalities, of peoples upon various planes of development, truly complicates world organization, but is not necessarily insurmountable. A greater complexity will lie in the economic adjustment of commercial rivalries among the large nations and in the threatening of the sense of power. Yet here, above all else, economic necessity itself will compel some kind of orderly regulation. In any case, master works are seldom accomplished easily. Great efforts are wrought patiently and painfully, and succeed, often, only after innumerable failures. When the history of a federated world is written, its origin will be traced to the derided writings of the Abbé de Saint-Pierre and later to Rousseau and to Kant, through the gropings of Henry of

Navarre and Alexander of Russia, through the efforts of the Vienna Congress, the London Concert and the Berlin Conference, up to the sessions of the Hague Tribunal and the Versailles Congress, following the great Allied victory over the ancient autocracies of Central Europe. These events will be noted as historic failures, though essential stepping stones over many complexities and necessary preambles of ultimate success.

The first League of Nations — practically born when the major part of the world united, pooling its resources to overthrow German militarism — may be crude in its form as the depleted war-worn nations that create it are weak. But it will grow strong as it becomes amended to meet human needs. Moreover, we must not expect too much of this first-born child of the Universe, sired by sorrow, baptized in blood, but nourished hungrily at the broad breast of a world-wide desire for justice. We must not expect that the machinery of a League of Free Peoples will spring into being a perfected, finished product. The first framework of a federated world has been likened to the first steam engine whose attenuated outlines may be seen in the Metropolitan Museum — a spindling model very different from the mammoth steel and iron structure that now hauls nations over their boundary lines and makes communication between states possible. The essential of even a first League of Nations, like the essential of the

crudest of engines, is that its principles *work*; that its machinery possess power to move the nations over the border line of their own hostilities toward a more mutual faith in each other and in an organized and abiding good will, and that the democracies of the world uphold it.

The mechanism of a League of Nations must be made to "go" no matter what difficulties it presents. Its ideal must be embodied in reality because no other plan to check imperialistic ambitions is feasible and because the alternative is altogether too terrifying.

Let women pause and consider what this alternative is. Either nations must be prepared individually, constantly and gigantically, against the power of a single state to destroy at will the equipoise of civilization; either they must be willing to have the millstone of a permanent and unprecedented militarism hung around their necks; either they must place bayonets in the hands of boys for generations to come and pile taxes without limit upon the backs of future toilers; either they must acknowledge that idealism utterly fails and that civilization must be frankly founded upon brute force — or they must assist in organizing the common defense of society as a whole. For, unless we combine the resources of the world and control inventions of destruction, science tells us that the wars of the future, when vast armies of bird-men can fly over cities and wipe out whole communities

with poisoned bombs, will make the present conflict seem like a Lilliputian effort.

To condemn the plan of a unified League as Utopian because of its lack of precedent is to discount the exceptional achievements of nations and men in the past. The freeing of the slaves by Lincoln was without precedent. Against the advice of his councillors, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, *in war time*. The United States did not look for a precedent when it returned its indemnity to China, after the Boxer Rebellion — an altogether unprecedented precedent in diplomatic circles. Great occasions create their own historic warrant. That the veins of humanity have been opened by a voracious autocracy, that the life of humanity has been ebbing and will continue to ebb past rehabilitation if conditions are not changed and that the overthrow of old autocracies has precipitated new forms of governments that demand immediate co-operative protection — should be precedent enough for to-day.

"He who waits to have his task marked out
Shall die and leave his errand unfulfilled."

Every new idea is called Utopian by heavily weighted materialists — until it functions. Then it is pronounced "practical" and "inevitable," even by the very reactionaries who most bitterly opposed it. The laying of the Atlantic cable, the magic of

capturing power from cataracts, the gift of wings to man, all were scientifically demonstrated to be impossible — upon paper. But Cyrus Field kept his faith, Robert Fulton experimented, and Wilbur Wright quietly built new planes as old ones failed to rise from the earth. In the lexicon of truth there is no such word as fail. The imagination of great men feeds upon difficulties and exercises itself upon overcoming them. The ant finds his food in anthills near the earth, but the elephant bends forest trees and with his trunk reaches for nourishment in the topmost branches.

Again, to call the ideal of an inter-dependent, organized world without war impractical is not only to acknowledge oneself crassly uncreative, but also it is to applaud wastefulness, since it ignores the unused administrative faculty of women. No one knows what is possible or impossible for governments to accomplish until the vast, creative, political possibilities of women have been fully liberated and have functioned upon all planes of the executive. Then we may talk of success or failure in governments, not before. The unused political strength of women is the great unmined asset of the future. We may not look for stability among nations until we have worked this intersecting vein and until women are upon all the frontiers of civilization, officially guarding humanity with men. As the war has taught states that their economic output may be immeasurably

increased by the services of women, so it is to be hoped that governments may yet glimpse the fact that the state, in its political security, may be immeasurably strengthened by the inherent guardianship of women.

It may be that the fate of a democratic League of Nations lies in this unused reservoir of human strength. It may be that world unity waits upon the consciousness of women to help attain it. It may be that only as ethically-minded women add their constructive energy to the energies of ethically-minded men and work for a world league that it will be possible to build a Temple of Justice for humanity and not a bristling Arsenal of Destruction.

When women familiarize themselves with this ideal and fully comprehend what it means to them and to posterity; when they realize that only by propagating and supporting an organized, unified world plan may they themselves hope to approximate for their children a civilization without warfare — it is inconceivable that women in large numbers will not rally to its support and overcome all opposition. Nothing is more certain than that unless women throw the weight of their new influence upon the side of a broader liberalism in reconstruction, the ruling element, naturally conservative and desiring to re-establish old sanctions and old privileges rather than to think out new ones, will triumph as it has triumphed in the past.

Then we shall have, not a new world founded upon a new spirit of universal justice, but a shabby, slightly-edited version of the old one — and world chaos must be faced again. Then we shall not have defeated Prussianism, and the war, even though military victory has been overwhelmingly on the side of the Allied cause, will have failed in its supreme purpose — the defeat of war itself, and the organization of a stabilized world peace.

In the countries recently at war, the tired nerves of statesmen are worn with war problems and burdened with a weight of material questions. It is difficult to see how they are to spring to this initial task of reconstruction, to the creation of a world without war, a world built upon unifying human principles, unless they are practically upheld and supported by envisioned, idealistic men and women. The hope of a world, liberated from the iron yoke of the ages, may fail through lack of a strong enduring will to sustain it in the face of reactionary resistance.

To ask women to help supply this sustaining power may seem to be a heavy burden to lay upon women, also war-worn, many of them still politically unconscious, but it is surely not so grievous a burden as the weight of sustaining future wars. Moreover, women, through maternity, have a genuine *race consciousness* that enables them to rise to a real race call, and certainly no cry from an outraged humanity was ever so deep and so

agonized as this one. Other wars have been fought for a principle, such as slavery, or individual rights — the principle of liberty in some form of application to life. This war was waged for the principle of *life itself*: whether wars forever are to cease and men in reality are to possess themselves — as freedom is of little use if it does not carry with it the guarantee of life to enjoy it — or whether some ambitious over-lord, some subtle, future Kaiser or some predatory interest, forever is to have the power to conscript them. Surely an age capable of producing women who can form a Battalion of Death to fight side by side with men in battle, is also capable of producing women able to organize a Battalion of Life, in peace, and of working constructively side by side with men in governments, to protect life and sustain it.

Is there any foundation for believing that the entrance of women into public affairs will supply a new and enduring idealism? Comparisons continue to be odious but sometimes are necessary though it is to be hoped that the war, as it has destroyed so many traditions, will also lift the activities of men and women above the region of comparison. If men are more intellectual than women, we now frankly admit that they have had longer mental opportunities. If women are more chaste than men, we acknowledge (reluctantly) that it may be because men have insisted upon greater virtue in women, since intellect and moral-

ity are seen to be human, not sex, attributes. But when we regard the field of humaneness, is there not scientific, biological ground for claiming, without rancor, that women are more humane than men? Men can build cities, assemble machines and create rare harmonies. But they may not know the miracle of having a little child wrought slowly within them, an experience carrying with it a peculiar psychological as well as physiological enrichment. They may not know the tenderness that giving sustenance and ministering to a little one bestows. They may not envisage the Heaven that lies in a child's eyes and that leaves some of its radiance, trailing clouds of glory, in the mother's. More social than women? Yes. Association in industry for many years, while women worked separately and individually, has socialized men first. But as humane? No. Because women have stood so closely related to the humanities, because a woman's body is the aqueduct of life to every mortal, she is and must remain the High Priestess of the humane. If conditions had been reversed, for instance, and women had been the ruling sex for centuries, it is not possible to imagine that the race would still settle its difficulties by the ancient process of massacre. The humanity of women would have prevented. As humane as woman man is not and perhaps never may be, except through the most heroic effort upon his part and the most conscious patient education of

man upon hers. Even though it hurts both men and women, man must be taught a new table of human values, and taught by women. Emancipated women must stop being followers, submissive subjects to ideals that they know to be outgrown and evil, and, listening to the inner voices of nature, must teach men by creating new ideals, new estimates of life that alone may give security to the children of the future. The humaneness of women, functioning for society, must be wrought into the foundations of the new world state.

What do we mean by humaneness in government? We mean that there must be a new and compelling emphasis in public affairs. Because man's part in the creation of life is minor, because his time has been given largely to accumulation and guarding his accumulation, his regard for life has been minor. In consequence, we have had a system of government erected with the emphasis laid upon protecting wealth rather than upon protecting humanity. The cheapness of life has indeed been every day's tragedy. The whole edifice of government has been erected upon the foundation of the sacred conservation of property. What is now needed is a new decalogue of values with the emphasis laid first and foremost upon the necessity for the sacred conservation of *life*.

Surely this great truth must soon break through the consciousness of the myriads of earnest women who have so faithfully helped to sustain the war:

that the principle of life is placed largely in women's hands; that it is meant to be a continuing principle, and that in order that it continue, unbroken and assured, even to the humblest worker, women must not only *give life but must guarantee it.* Women must end wars by aiding in organizing constructive peace. For this reason have they come into the kingdom. For this supreme purpose have they had their long, dark struggle for human rights that ultimately they might assure, to all mankind, this greatest of all human rights — the unbroken gift of life.

The ideal of a league of all nations offers to guarantee life so far as it is possible to guarantee it in a world where false valuations have so long maintained. Its general establishment, upon truly democratic principles, offers the one, the only, practical possibility of preventing war. For this reason, its success should be of the most vital interest to women, and they should force themselves to study its doctrine, to help overcome its difficulties and to spread its principles as the highest form of present day patriotism and racial duty

Chapter II.

EXISTING INTERNATIONAL FORMS.

"What we want is the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." President Wilson's Mount Vernon Speech, July 4, 1918.

OF course to propose to "organize the opinion of mankind" before the world was sufficiently unified to hold a common opinion would have been folly. To talk of a Community of Nations when several weeks were spent in sailing from America to Europe would have been anticipating invention. But steam and electricity have changed all that. When George Washington was inaugurated, the news required three weeks to travel from the Capital to Boston. To-day, the President of the United States speaks in the morning from Paris to the dock strikers in New York, and before night the strikers return to their work. Once, months were required to send a letter from the United States to Hawaii; recently a whisper over a wire was heard from Washington to Honolulu. Immigration, also, has drawn the peoples of the earth together, and has not been confined to America, although America has been the great melting-pot of nations. In fact,

modern methods of travel and communication have transformed and unified the world until we are in reality one people, with different tongues, perhaps, different religions, but with common aims and with one land to dwell in which must be made safe and hospitable for all.

The main criticism made against a League of Nations is that in spite of this drawing together of peoples, international action against war is impossible.

This chapter is to show that already we have international action in many fields, while in others equally important, we still suffer from lack of unified agreements.

Perhaps no part of our political structure has been found so defective from lack of organization, as the framework of our foreign relations. The war has taught us that our Foreign Policy is worse than chaotic. It is still individualistic and monarchial. In its internal relations, each state has worked out a degree of harmonious adjustment to modern conditions. But in its external affairs, states have not yet evolved common, co-ordinating principles. In the telephone period of evolution, each nation manages its foreign relations as though it were still in the stage-coach era. In consequence, the destinies of millions of people are left, not in the hand of representatives elected by the will of the people, but in the hands of representatives of a small though ruling class,

appointed by governments. Even after a war waged for democracy, the Peace Table was encircled in the same ancient, monarchial fashion! The requirements of these foreign officials are wealth, social position, culture — literature preferred — with some knowledge of international law. And they are allowed almost unlimited power. An indiscreet colonial Secretary may plunge an Empire into war; a backward thinking diplomat may bathe even a modern Republic in a sea of blood.

In the old days of the divine rule of kings it was logical that foreign ministers should wield this life-and-death power. The King was not only a celestially delegated sovereign but also he was the nominal possessor of the State. The minister was his agent, looking after his property, dispossessing undesirable tenants and annexing desirable ones, much as an astute real estate agent to-day looks after an expanding plutocrat's interests. A minister's ascendancy even actually depended upon his success in intrigue and conquest.

Modern life with its rudimentary democracy has overcome much of this license. Parliamentary assemblies, a press that reflects (or creates!) public opinion, quick communication between states, have shorn the diplomat of some of his power. Yet he remains a potential menace and his ability to provoke mischief is still practically unchecked. In every country the people may waken to find themselves committed to a foreign program which

they themselves did not choose but which "national honor" requires them, nevertheless, to uphold.

"For a cap and bells our lives we pay,
Bubbles we buy with a whole soul's tasking,"

because some Janus-faced official has applied the court tactics of Louis the XIVth to the republican principles of to-day. It is true that we no longer require our diplomats to quote the classics or to discriminate in vintages. But it is required, in Europe, at least, that he shall be a Prince of Indirection. It is required, or was until recently, that he shall checkmate his competitors' kings and scoop in all the pawns for his side. In short, governments have insisted that diplomacy be a game to be played primarily for each sovereign state's solitary advantage, instead of making it a system of organized relationships to be administered in the interest of the sovereign people in all states.

Some one has said that there is no such thing as a friendly nation, and this is true so long as the old system of putting a premium upon intrigue maintains. We have wasted reams of paper in decrying diplomats and their secret machinations when they are the logical fruits of a corruptible system. "Before you begin to think about politics at all," Walter Lippman says in *A Preface to Politics,* "you have to abandon the notion that there is a war between good and bad men." If we want a different character of representative we

must originate a different method of selection. We must have men elected by the people, men who know the growing needs of everyday life, not officials who know primarily the needs of a small, over-comfortable class. This was our most important war aim — next to the primary aim that there should be no more war — and cannot be too often repeated: *We must democratize diplomacy.* Otherwise, our recoil against our former foreign policy is as ineffective as condemnation of capitalists for accumulating millions that they cannot well avoid accumulating and needs must return, in the shape of huge welfare foundations, to the people who produced them. Our own ethical looseness, our economic and political indifference, are responsible for our undemocratic diplomacy and for the other preventable ills from which we suffer.

An inexorable fate has punished well this moral laxity, and will punish us still further. After the horse is stolen we now prepare to lock the barn door. The desire for a democratic League of Nations is the outcome of the engulfing of civilization — a determination of the peoples to build a system of international relations upon democratic foundations open to daylight and to say good-by forever to the underground methods of the mole. As there are fire companies to put out fires in municipalities, so it is intended that there shall be a modern enginery that shall move quickly to quench world ignitions. At last, after organizing

all forms of life, exept inter-state forms, the world realizes that governments, above all else, require careful organization; that in no other course, except safety for all, lies safety for any, and that this safety must not be left in the hands of individuals but that new and definite, common machinery must be provided to settle the inevitable economic and political disputes between states. If a nation needs markets, if the turning of her wheels of industry depends upon freer access to raw materials, if she wishes to enlarge her boundaries for a crowding population, some modern mechanism open to all to facilitate these changes must be created, other than the ancient recourse to the primeval club and filching from one's neighbor's preserves, resulting in the unloosing of murder, arson and rape.

The patriots who sponsor the League of Nations propose to change our Foreign Policy by building an International Tribunal for the referment of inter-state ambitions. In times of crises, they claim, diplomacy fails, not only because it is undemocratic, but also largely because no supernational machinery offers authority for change. What these men propose to supply is standards of regulation, tables of measurement, whereby the ruthless, individualistic license of imperialistic nations may be directed and controlled, anarchy being no more desirable in States than in individuals.

For individuals, it is claimed, society has slowly and painfully worked out common rules and common measurements of standards. Individuals who take life, for instance, are called murderers, not heroes, and are incarcerated and punished by law. Indeed, in all civilized countries, the law forbids the individual to carry arms. Families, too, who disturb public order are arrested and bound to "keep the peace." States, alone, are allowed to move outside the law, accumulating all the weapons they choose and using them to destroy life at will, embracing a course socially disrupting, disorganizing to industry and destroying the morale of the Household of Nations.

But, someone suggests, will not this super-control limit the freedom of nations? Will states submit to this restriction of their individual rights? Freedom is a curious anomaly. Like many other spiritual qualities, it is gained by relinquishing it. Freedom has been well defined by Professor Beard, who says that "the essence of liberty is the recognition of other people's liberties." This recognition means restriction. and organized restriction, in the interest of all, is the basis of democracy. There seems to be no more reason why states, even democratic states, should be allowed a wider area of freedom than individuals. How much actual unrestricted freedom has a citizen of the United States?

In New York City, for instance, as in all modern

municipalities, public order is maintained by a system of civic denials. In no hour of the day is the individual in reality free in the sense that he is socially irresponsible. Let any woman attempt to cross Fifth Avenue in some original way, and see what will happen. She must sprint for her life or submit to being run over. The proper way to cross this surging artery has been defined and is enforced. You may be in the most urgent hurry to travel from east to west, but a tall figure quells you with a glance from his Hibernian eye or a majestic wave of a white-gloved hand. You do not retaliate by going out and striking him, although you may feel a desire to! You know the penalty, and you prefer your own bed to a plank in a cell. Instead, you obey, the film of your countenance registering either humor or irritation, according to your temperament as you wait, like the Children of Israel at the Red Sea, for the tide of traffic to roll back. Nor will a taxi or a luxurious limousine help you. If you travel on wheels you must keep to a certain side of the street; you must halt at every congested corner, which is almost every corner; and in various side streets you may drive through one way only. In fact, in popular hours, a snail could beat a Rolls-Royce in a race up Fifth Avenue. The same restrictions follow practically all around the clock. We eat, sleep, dress, worship and build our houses according to prearranged dictations. Under no circum-

stances is the individual in reality free, or rather he gains liberty only by a series of restrictions enforced upon all.

Why, in this land of the free, do we submit to these repressions? There can be but one answer. The policeman is there because we put him there to take care of us. We respect the law because we made the law for our common good. Laws that are made contrary to public opinion cannot be enforced. We obey because we have agreed to obey; because, by mutual consent, as units of a municipality, we have consented to relinquish a minimum of freedom for a maximum of safety.

Exactly in the same manner, and upon the consent of the governed, it is proposed to regulate for the common safety the unrestrained lawlessness of states. No nation may be allowed to travel on the wrong side of the world's highway. No nation may be permitted to obstruct world traffic. Crossroads and waterways must be internationalized and made free. Authority must be established and obeyed in the aggregate as well as in the particular. Only through common, interstate agreements, centrally enforced, may safety for all be found. If recalcitrant nations refuse to submit to a higher authority and deliberately break the traffic regulations of states — and most wars spring from a desire to turn the tide of world traffic — the Court of the World will deal with them, imposing fines and penalties as civil courts

inflict penalties upon individual offenders. If a State persist in its predatory ambitions, the armed force of the world should proceed against it, or the economic weapon be used to restore it to sanity and order.

But an even more compelling consideration than an outgrown Foreign Policy is driving us toward a unified new world order. Fortunately, international progress already has sunk its roots deep in economic soil. History has ever a fashion of preceding us, which is only another way of saying that the economic organization of common world interests has long anticipated political organization and that commerce already is international. The manufacture and exchange of everyday, human necessities has drawn people together and united them as nothing else could unite them, paving the way for political fusion. Once, each nation fed itself, living in solitary nationalism. To-day, each country produces whatever is best suited to the character of its resources, exchanging the manufactured article for food or raw materials and unconsciously flying the banner of internationalism. This interchange is well illustrated by England where land on the tight little island has become too valuable for agriculture and where the factory has superseded the farm. When we recognize the fact that a failure to receive wheat, for instance, might mean famine for the nation, we see how vital England's uninterrupted sea routes become

and why she must cling to "freedom of the seas." Her trade lines are her arteries of life. Through our common exchanges, in internationalism we move and have our being — only we do not realize it. Your little girl, playing upon the doorstep, may be an animated example of internationalism. The wool of her skirt from Australia, her hair-ribbon from France, the Irish linen of her blouse, her sweater from Switzerland, all proclaim the economic interdependence of nations, and demand that we shake off our political sluggishness and create machinery to standardize the world's commerce and enable trade to flow in and out of countries, practically stabilized and regulated by the supreme law of supply and demand.

But it is not only along industrial lines that economic organization has anticipated political organization. Capital itself has become international. In 1914, after the invasion of Belgium, when the London Stock Exchange closed, the sound reverberated through the world. Every stock exchange closed its doors, also, so closely knit has international credit become — the borrowings and burrowings of finance, delicate and indirect, often, but so far-reaching that they ride the Atlantic and Pacific cables and attain the very Antipodes. If this were true before the war, it is trebly true to-day, when through the borrowing and lending of belligerents and neutrals, capital has become so colossally international that it would

seem necessary, now that the war is over, to establish a separate Court of World Finance and summon all the budding Hamiltons of all nations to extricate the tangle!

Every day finds us living more strongly entrenched by international ties. When the clock was moved forward an hour, and the summer sunset was deferred, it was a pretty tribute to our widespread agreement as to time. We may scatter or garner the hours as we will, but we have agreed upon one standard — Greenwich time. Imagine the confusion if each state were allowed to set its watch at will! Shall we submit to the regulation of our hours, our seconds, even, and refuse to accept a criterion of those intersecting political and economic activities whose orderly regulation would insure life to our children's children? We have also adopted a universal metric system, controlling our weights and measures, and in Hygiene, we have a system of Quarantine and International Sanitary Commission brought about largely by the old-time, oriental plagues and by the necessity of preventing the spread of their infection in Europe — a system fought bitterly by large nations which considered the Quarantine a restriction of trade.

But it is the Universal Postal Union, which, after a life of forty years, remains the most successful example of concerted international administration, and offers us hope that in time we may achieve a common mechanism of world peace.

Once each state originated and maintained its separate postal tax. But in the Nineteenth Century, as soon as commercial relations upon a large scale between states became possible, it was seen that some form of mutual postal regulation was necessary. The system first chosen was one "to make the foreigner pay." Ridiculously high rates were thus imposed upon the country of dispatch, the country to which the letter was sent and any intermediatory country through which it might pass, as well as a sea tax. For instance, at one time there were three different rates between Germany and Austria. Once, "a letter sent from the United States to Australia was confronted with the fact, arrived at after some calculation, that the postage would be 5 cents, 33 cents, 45 cents, 60 cents, or $1.02 per ½ oz., according to the route by which it was sent." (Reinsch, Public International Union.)

Many years elapsed before the world agreed to put an end to this confusing variability of tariff and to submit its Postal regulations to a super-state control. Each nation feared, as it fears to-day in the idea of political federation, that the proposal carried a hidden menace to sovereignty and nationality — so abysmal is the egotism of states! But economic necessity at last put to rout national vanity, and in 1878 the Universal Postal Union, with an elaborate form of International machinery, was established, with headquarters at Berne,

Switzerland, where it has since continued to function. Its Congress of Plenipotentiaries may meet every five years or when demand is made by two-thirds of the Congress, each country having one vote.

Naturally its rules frequently have to be amended. An amusing occasion necessitating change is related by Woolf in his *International Government*. The Bible Societies of England and America publish more Bibles than any other book, dispatching them in large numbers to the Orient where the Mohammedan does not reciprocate by sending us his sacred literature, the Koran, thus equalizing the postal exchange. Great Britain and America, naturally, retain the revenue on these shipments. But travel in Persia — the land of philosophers and poets, but not the land of Pullmans and Postmen — is slow and costly. The camel is still the ship of the desert, and the transportation of tons of Bibles by strings of camels became a threatening national expense, religion and bankruptcy arriving by the same shipment, as it were. At a recent conference, a Persian delegate drew the attention of the Congress to the injustice and the cost of transportation was more equally distributed.

So interdependent have nations become that the year before the war saw two hundred International Congresses, embracing science, the arts and industry, held in Europe. Facts like these speak louder

than words and offer argument for the creation and maintenance of a political framework to uphold and sustain the world's well-established economic exchanges.

It may appear that the earnest consideration of these subjects, the reconstruction of our Foreign Policy, the protection of our existing forms of international activities, are too intricate and far from home for women to embrace — women who largely heretofore have found their most weighty considerations to be whether they should serve beef or mutton for dinner, if they belonged to the well-to-do class, or whether they could afford to buy meat at all if they dwelt below the hunger line. But are these problems in reality distant since they may bear the seeds of future wars? Let every mother who has given a son to German aggression, answer. Let every women who has had her heart and hearth desolated by war, reply!

Chapter III.

THE OLD BALANCE OF POWER.

"The book of Kings is closing and the book of the people is opening." Edwin Markham. Victory Address.

THE alternative to a League of Nations is a return to the system known as the Balance of Power, a system which the peoples of the world had thought the war had discredited, but which, as late as December 30, 1918, M. Clemenceau publicly declared he had not entirely renounced.

Women who would forever end war must realize clearly what this principle did for Europe and civilization, even, although it was an honest effort to co-ordinate states.

The Balance of Power was a system intended to preserve so perfect an equilibrium between states that no one state would have power to enforce its will upon the rest. Each state was supremely sovereign, jealous and as a rule so widely separated from its neighbors that there was little thought of reciprocity. The maintenance of this theory became a fundamental of diplomacy and an axiom of political science. If a state

attempted to overturn it and make laws for the rest, it was held to be the right and duty of every Power to interfere and put down such domination even by force of arms.

In order to give our consideration to this principle in operation, it is essential to regard it with European, not American, eyes. Accustomed as we are to living with vast contingent plains of unoccupied territory and among 110,000,000 people nearly all of whom eventually become naturalized, and where there is but one accepted language, the task is not easy. We must picture the European continent — a peninsula of Asia — swarming with sixty distinct nationalities speaking almost as many tongues; we must see these peoples, in various stages of development, crowding and overflowing onto each other's doorsteps, stepping upon each other's cherished traditions and settling their national disputes as they had settled their individual disputes before the law forbade — by blows. We must observe the fever-spots of Europe that have long bred war. Turkey, the threshold to the East, the Ottoman Empire that has created unrest in Europe for centuries and that must continue to offer a field for aggression until its future is guaranteed by international agreement; the Balkans, whose ever-present war-clouds have appeared once a week on the horizons of our Sunday press, to be absorbed with our morning coffee — and as quickly forgotten. And we must

see these Balkan States, a very hotbed of national suppression and aggression because used as tools by Russia and Austria who constantly embroiled them against each other, pushing their way outward to the sea as a necessity of existence; Serbia, the "dry corridor of the sea," befriended by Russia to block Austria's free access; Bohemia, "the bridge to the East," the land of the Czechs and the Slavs, whose independence the Allies have recognized after a century of revolt against the Hapsburgs; a land where, Professor Masaryk, leader of the Bohemian Revolutionary forces, tells us, 10,000,000 subjects were forced to fight for the Dual Monarchy and where probably 60,000 people were shot because they refused to bear arms. We must note Russia, struggling for decades for the control of the Straits, for Constantinople and Armenia, and then refusing the Moslem City when her amazing Revolution ripened and declared itself against all annexations. We must see France, drawn into the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 by the perfidy of Bismarck, crippled and robbed of her provinces, weakened by an indemnity of $5,000,000,000, yet, by her unprecedented thrift, paying this indemnity in a few years — thus furnishing Germany with the initial capital for her modern industrial development. And we must think of France, not as the irridescent nation known to American tourists as a center for gowns and gastronomics; nor yet in terms of

cant as the "France who has found her soul," since she never lost it, because it dwells where it has ever dwelt in her splendid peasants who were given land and self-respect after the French Revolution; we must think rather of this great state as France the indomitably industrious, reaching out for raw materials because deprived of her invaluable coal fields in Lorraine. We must see the blue waters of the Mediterranean reflecting man's early struggle, the pivotal point in history, policed now, not by Roman galleys, but by British battleships, guarded at one end by the fortress of Gibraltar and at the other end by the Suez Canal to watch over Egypt and India — the waterway to the East, always the East. And we must observe the European struggle for outlets, more and more outlets, not only for peoples but also for goods and capital, as running current with the struggle for nationality. Then we may comprehend the words of H. N. Brailsford when he wrote that the Prussian assault upon civilization, "violent, non-moral and predatory though it was, did not aim for conquest in Europe but expansion beyond Europe by means of a victory in Europe." The war indeed was a war between autocracy and democracy. But that is but one-half the arc. The other half covers long-smouldering economic rivalries and imperialistic ambitions. Women, so naïve and trusting in economics because heretofore so far removed from national finance, must

remember that so ardent a patriot as Maj.-Gen. Leonard Wood has said that six out of seven wars in history were trade wars. The European clash is no exception. To many of us in this country the war crystalized around the necessity for overthrowing German militarism. In Europe the problem was not so simple. In Europe this essential was only the beginning of the complex task. Rather was it, the war once ended with victory to the Allies, how shall weak nations be protected from stronger nations and a second world holocaust be avoided? How shall the rights of backward peoples be guarded? Above all, how shall growing industrial states expand, where shall they expand and at whose expense? Particularly did the European war culminate in Asia Minor and rouse the inquiry: Who shall exploit or partition Turkey since it is the stepping stone to the Far East and to that mecca of finance — China?

Over all these clashings of interstate interests the Balance of Power presided, a juggler vainly trying to keep all the gold and the silver balls from colliding. And yet, given the history of Europe with its inherited traditions, it would seem as if the Balance of Power were inevitable. Like the camel's hump or the elephant's trunk, it grew, only unlike the hump and the trunk it may be removed and is being removed, though the process required the surgical operation of a world war.

The Balance of Power originated about the

Sixteenth Century when the modern sovereign state system began to form. Various events contributed, primarily, the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, and the destruction of the idea of Europe as one state, ruled over by Emperor and Pope.

The Balance of Power became a method whereby sovereign states, through special friendships and combinations, attempted to maintain European equilibrium by keeping a check on each other. This was done primarily by diplomacy which, under the tutelage of Machiavelli, began that career of intrigue and rivalry that has since become so well known. Each diplomat conceived of a balance, however, as something in his country's favor. But, in the absence of any super-national authority, it will be seen that there was nothing to check either a designing diplomat's ambition or a reckless state's will. An imaginative adventurer, even, could upset the "balance" and drench all Europe in blood.

Gradually these maneuverings set into rival groups contending for Empire. England, France, Spain colonized in the new world and in Africa; Germany alone, disrupted by internal religious controversies, failed to extend her borders over seas. The idea of dynasty and legitimacy strengthened as royal families uneugenically intermarried, placing as many offshoots as possible upon thrones, until, later, Queen Victoria was called the "Grandmother of all the courts of Europe."

The opening of the Congress of Vienna, after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, was hailed as the beginning of a new era in which the demand of common purposes were to rule. But diplomats had learned nothing from the French Revolution. They could not grasp the fact that sovereignty was passing gradually away from monarchs and into the hands of the people, and that kings themselves were doomed. And so they divided the spoils of war in the ancient historic manner, and the world was treated, as usual, as real estate to be parceled out amongst the executors of Napoleon's Empire, sovereigns by "divine right," with the wishes of the people themselves disregarded. The efforts for a central federated government on the part of the Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe failed. That this failure was more or less welcomed by diplomacy throughout Europe was shown by a letter written by George Canning, English foreign minister, in 1823. Speaking of Jean Baptiste Villele, Minister of Finance, after the fall of Richelieu, Canning said: "Villele is a minister of thirty years ago, no *revolutionary scoundrel* but constitutionally hating England, as Cresent and Vergennes used to hate us; and so things are getting back to a wholesome state again. Every nation for itself and God for us all!"

Up to this time the rivalry in the Balance of Power had been primarily political. But with the

development of mechanical invention, the world suffered its greatest change since the Renaissance. It entered its great industrial era, the period in which we are now living, a period that has revolutionized life and to which we are still so ill adjusted. The great states of Europe then become enormous industrial centers competing for the markets of the world and for raw materials. The Balance of Power took on unprecedented lines. Old enmities were forgotten, age-long feuds faded as self-protection led these modern industrial states into the most amazing of alliances, contradicting the antagonisms of the past.

There was reason. After the Franco-Prussian war Germany emerged as the strong power of Europe. She had subdued her rival, Austria; she had humbled France by the capture of her capital, crowning the Hohenzollern monarch, William I, King of Prussia, in the halls of Versailles; and she had robbed her fallen foe of two of her choicest provinces, Alsace and Lorraine. Moreover, although Europe had not learned the advantages of federation, even after Napoleon had mowed down sovereign states, Bismarck had learned the valued lesson. Bismarck performed miracles and transformed a warring community made up of petty jealous kings into a unified strong state. For the next quarter of a century Germany developed internally, building up an industrial empire that made her a factor to be feared and

reckoned with in the economic forces of Europe and of the world.

But Germany was doomed from the start. Germany built her new Empire upon the wrong foundations and so dug her own grave. The bulwark on which she placed dependence was militarism, borrowed from Rome after the Teutonic invasions broke up the Roman Empire in the Fifth Century; militarism, the dependence of kings, but dethroned by democracy which places strength, not in the force of arms, but in the sovereign will of the people. Germany invited her doom again when she accepted the leadership of the Iron Chancellor who not only belived in brute force but who openly flaunted the breaking of treaties by declaring that treaties were not binding "when the private interests of those who lie under them no longer reinforces the text;" Bismarck, the corrupting, who defied public opinion and told his generals that it was "their business to create public opinion." The Germany that was truly great in music and in letters was the Germany previous to 1878, before the chill of a policy of blood and iron had entered her soul.

Gradually, pricked by economic rivalries and goaded by the competition in armaments set by this new and bristling Empire, the Balance of Power formed into contending camps known as the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. A brief glance at the origin of these alliances reveals the elements

of discord that were sown and that eventually destroyed European civilization in 1914.

In 1879, Germany, having defeated both her near neighbors, Austria and France, made a treaty with Austria which guaranteed neutral support to the two states in case of attack from the great Bear of the North — Russia. Not satisfied with this guarantee of help, Bismarck, in 1884, supplemented this treaty with one of his famous "reinsurance treaties" with Russia, whereby Germany bound herself not to join her ally, Austria, in an attack upon Russia! Subsequently, in 1878, when Bismarck failed to support Russia in the Berlin Congress, disappointing Russian hopes by saying that he could only play the part of an "honest broker" in the settlement, the friendship (?) between the countries cooled and the treaty, when it expired, was not renewed. In 1882, Italy, after long contemplating whether she should join her historic enemy, Austria, or pin faith to her historic enemy, France, gave her allegiance to the Central Empires and the Triple Alliance was concrete and complete, continuing until the outbreak of the war in 1914.

The Triple Entente was born in 1894, when France, marvelously recuperated after her 1870 defeat — but with statues always wearing crepe-trimmed wreaths, symbolic of her lost provinces, Alsace-Lorraine, in the Place de la Concorde — made a treaty with Russia whose lagging industries

she had long financed. The text has never been published, but is generally accepted as insurance against an attack from Central Europe. In a strategic sense, this treaty was a shrewd stroke, necessitating that Germany, in case of war, would have to be doubly reinforced, since she must defend herself simultaneously on both eastern and western fronts.

In 1904, after the Morocco incident, which nearly precipitated war between Germany and France, England and France joined forces in a treaty which was further strengthened by an agreement between England and Russia in 1907, whereby these great Powers regulated their relations in the near East. The Triple Alliance emerged and the armed peace which was the "chronic malady of Europe" for twenty years, passed into alarmingly acute stages. All of these treaties were "defensive," however, each country promising to come to the support of the other in case of an attack by some mysterious offensive power.

Although these alliances were made in all sincerity to check the ambition of expanding sovereign states and maintain European equilibrium, it must be recognized that in reality they did not safeguard, did not "balance." The group system, whatever else it may have accomplished, did not offer security, did not stabilize nations since it kept them "balancing" over a chasm of distrust

and suspicion. When England made a treaty with Japan whereby Japan was to furnish 300,000 troops in case India was invaded, and reinsured herself with a like treaty with Russia, Great Britain did not relax her naval vigilance. Instead, she built more Dreadnoughts! No nation trusted another nation, and, indeed, under the system of intensive competition in high finance, with each state pushing out for itself and with no power to check a state's imperialistic tendencies, it is difficult to see how trust between European nations could have been established and maintained.

Always at different stages of the various interstate crises that preceded the war there were peoples and statesmen who saw the inevitable precipice toward which Empires were sliding, greasing their own road to destruction, as it were. Coincident with competition in armaments grew the Peace movement, which with the Labor movement and the Woman's movement became the storm centers of agitation of modern times. The first Hague Conference, in 1899, arose from the reaction of the young Tzar, Nicholas II, against the crushing military taxation pressed down upon an already over-taxed people. It failed of its purpose in substituting a Tribunal of Arbitration for war, as its successor, the second Hague Conference in 1907, failed, and as all Peace Conferences must fail as long as national, racial, and economic rivalry between states is stronger than the con-

sciousness of their common interests. A great war, entailing supreme sacrifice and destruction, was necessary to show competing states how unified and mutual are the interests of Mankind.

This, briefly, is the system of special alliances that forms the alternative to a League of Nations. Does Europe, does the world wish to return to it? The New York Times in an editorial said: "The Balance of Power, the Concert of Europe, was organized immorality. It habitually put down the weak in the interest of the strong, and shielded criminal nations when retribution threatened them."

Not only did the Balance of Power fail to promote security in Europe, but also it failed to prevent war. In the present century, before Austria declared war on Serbia and precipitated the World War, Europe, in thirteen years, had passed through five wars and five times had narrowly escaped fighting five more wars!

The wars that were fought were the Boer War, the Russo-Japanese War, and the war of Italy against Turkey for the possession of Tripoli — all Colonial in character, the last precipitating the two Balkan wars. The Balkan wars are of vital interest since they were the forerunner of the 1914 World War.

The first Balkan War — when Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece laid aside their ancient hostilities and united to drive the Turk from Europe — seemed

likely to eventuate in a strong Balkan confederation that would form a barrier to the German dream of expansion in the South. Consequently, this formidable obstruction to the Mittel-Europa scheme could not be permitted. In 1913, a second Balkan War followed, in which Bulgaria, strongly under German influence and incited by Berlin, made war upon Serbia over the partition of Macedonia. Unfortunately for German ambition, however, Serbia, the gallant and undaunted, won, and a strong Serbian State, assured of Russian support, would presently have been created directly across the pathway of Germany's imperialistic Eastern purposes. The immediate necessity was for the repression and obliteration of Serbia. This was accomplished by Austria's declaration of war against Serbia in 1914 — after the assassination of the Austrian Arch-duke offered Germany a flimsy pretext — guaranteeing to Germany the co-operation of her unreliable ally, Austria.

The five crises when wars were avoided were: the Morocco incident of 1905 and the Morocco incident of 1911; the crises between Austria and Russia in consequence of the annexation of Bosnia when war was narrowly averted in 1909, and again in 1912 when the Austrian and Russian armies partially mobilized and faced each other across their common frontier. The fifth crisis was found in the Italian war against Turkey when Austrian troops threatened to invade Italy. In all these

cases, some force other than the Great Powers themselves, probably the force that ultimately must overthrow all war, public opinion, intervened and compelled officials to listen to the general will.

Not only did the system of special alliances that have ruled Europe for the last twenty years breed wars, but also they bred that financial imperialism that is said to be the occasion of modern wars. With the change in the forms of wealth resulting from modern industrialism; with the accumulation of enormous sums of surplus capital seeking investments in foreign land where labor is cheap and returns on capital are high, imperialistic rivalries have taken on new and more involved forms. Not land but land schemes have been the goal of modern finance; concessions, monopolies, opportunity for building railroads and sinking mines. These "penetrations" have been peaceful or forceful, according as the occasion demanded, and while, in many instances, foreign occupation has resulted in a kind of beneficence for the appropriated races, more often the effect has been the exploitation of weaker peoples by the stronger, and the crushing of that inalienable desire — the wish to preserve national integrity.

A few concrete examples will suffice. Perhaps the Morocco incident is referred to oftenest as having paved the way for the world war and best illustrates the devious ways of financial imperialism. After the Franco-Prussian War in 1870,

Bismarck, not himself in favor of over-sea expansion, encouraged France to colonize, hoping to divert her attention from her wrongs in Alsace-Lorraine. The purchase of the Suez Canal shares by Lord Disraeli in 1875, and the British occupation in Egypt in 1882, crowded France out of Egypt and she turned her attention to Morocco. Algeria already had been occupied by France since 1830, and Tunis had been absorbed in 1881, adding 50,000 miles of African territory to France, thus making her the second greatest colonial power in Europe. But Germany, Spain and England already were in Morocco with conflicting claims, since Morocco, containing practically every known metal, especially iron ore, was a prize among colonies. The friendly occupation of Morocco was important to England, since its shores bordered on one side of her Mediterranean fortress, the Straits of Gibraltar.

England agreed to accede to France's claim in Morocco in return for a free hand in Egypt. In 1905, a secret treaty was signed between France and Great Britain, but was discovered and disputed by Germany. The German Emperor attended a conference of the Powers at Algeciras and was somewhat placated by being assured an "open door" in Morocco, where German capital already had established itself. Internal troubles with the Sultan and economic entanglements following, the French despatched troops to occupy Morocco;

Germany again protested, this time sending the *Panther* to Agadir. That war did not follow was probably due largely to the fact that the British fleet stood behind the French claim. The Kaiser, objecting to the parceling of territory without general agreement, said that hereafter "Germany must be so strong that nothing could happen without her consent." Certain portions of the French Congo were given to quiet the German Cerberus, and the Powers finally went home, tightened their belts and saw to it that their powder was dry. The Morocco affair, as has been said, undoubtedly slammed the doors in the faces of the peacemakers in Europe.

The partition of Persia offers further illumination of the methods by which the great Powers "balanced" their imperial aims. Russia was advancing to the sea. England was guarding Egypt, the Suez Canal, India and Australia, and both countries had large investments in Persia. In 1907, an agreement was signed whereby Russia was conceded the northern half of Persia for her "sphere of influence," and England was granted the lower half, with the valuable Persian Gulf. Between the two powers, a neutral zone was established in which both parties, might seek concessions. But at the time of this penetration, the Persians were attempting to establish self-government, or self-determination, as it is now called. The United States was appealed to for experts to

help untangle the financial chaos, and Mr. W. Morgan Shuster and a corps of workers were despatched. In the *Strangling of Persia,* Mr. Shuster has written frankly of his experience and of the methods used in the subjugation of the Shah and his people by foreign occupation.

The project of the Bagdad Railway, an undertaking that disturbed the diplomacy and finance of Europe for at least twenty years, leads directly to German dreams of conquest. When the young giant among empires turned to stretch his limbs, he found that he would have to extend them far outside of crowded Europe. The Near East was the gem of the diadem of colonies, since it offered not only rich fields for investment, but also held the key to the Far East. Twice the young German Emperor visited Turkey, offering "friendship" to the foundering Ottoman Empire and obtaining, in return, concessions for building the Bagdad Railway — an iron arm that was to reach from Berlin to Bagdad — an enterprise that, could it have been internationalized, would have been of inestimable benefit to civilization, for here was an overland route to the East opening up untold possibilities, among them the development of the plains of Mesopotamia, one of the great granaries of the future. Here was an outlet for engineers, scientists and numberless youths in one of those great land enterprises which should engage the huge industrial armies of the future. Under the control of one

sovereign state, however, and that one Germany, militantly imperialistic, the road became not a benefit, but a menace. For not only could goods be delivered in large quantities, but also soldiers and munitions. Russia, France and England all naturally saw their Eastern possessions threatened. For, while Germany asked at every bank in Europe for funds to build the road, she would allow no other country an equal control. The Bagdad Railway was to be a German railroad, directed by German interest, and was undoubtedly the formidable iron framework on which the empire Mittel-Europa was to rest. That her dream did not culminate was due to English determination. England, more than any other country, could not permit a land route to the East that she could not mutually control. By obtaining a protectorate of territory around Koweit, in Persia, Great Britain managed to control the Persian Gulf, and, by erecting another Gibraltar, prevented the Bagdad Railway from reaching the coveted Eastern waters.

The surrender of Bulgaria, the keystone to the arch of Mittel-Europa, in October, 1918, completely cut in two the Bagdad Railway scheme as a purely German project and was perhaps the most important strategical victory of the war to the Allied Cause.

The annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, one of the most palpable crimes of Central Europe before it precipitated the war, illustrates the opera-

tion of the Balance of Power at its worst. The Young Turk revolution occurred in 1908, resulting in an astonishing victory for the revolutionists and the re-establishing of the Turkish Constitution. It appeared as if the perplexing question of the Near East might have been settled by the warring nations themselves, united by the spirit of gaining their common liberty, had they received sufficient encouragement. But this modern, democratic solution of what had been an apparently insoluble problem did not appeal to the Central Powers, who preferred a disrupted Turkish state which they could "befriend."

As a result of the war, on October 5, 1908, Prince Ferdinand proclaimed himself King of Bulgaria. A few days later the aged Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph, consummated the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria thus thwarting the Serbian dream of an empire with outlets to the sea. In vain did the great powers of Europe rebel and protest against this political piracy, the most flagrant disregard of the principle laid down by the Concert of London in 1871, which decreed that, "contracting powers could only rid themselves of their treaty engagements by an understanding with their co-signatories," a treaty which Austria herself had signed. The Powers proposed a Conference to consider the question, but Austria-Hungary refused to confer and was able to maintain her position because upheld by

Germany. Germany emerged from this discreditable contest strengthened as a great power by the fact of her superior armament and her domestic initiative. The Balance of Power was killed by the Krupp industry; Europe fell back upon its mad reliance on armaments, building battleships or restoring its military laws in a vain effort to avert the crisis. Whatever had been left of moral force in diplomacy was there and then strangled by the ascendency of the German glorification of Might over Right which bided its power to strike.

Finally, the Balance of Power brought the system of parceling out territory among great states to its highest development. A perusal of the text of the Secret Treaties, signed by the great Powers before each entered the war, published by the Russian Revolutionists, reveals why President Wilson, in his Fourteen Principles of peace, placed as the first principle: "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

Every woman who sincerely wishes to help build a world without war should squarely face the historic facts of the Secret Treaties even though it is, as the Bishop of Oxford said in a sermon delivered at Cambridge, May 12, 1918, "with a feeling of deep humiliation and a fear that in Europe generally we are a long way from the full

recognition of the meaning and limits of legitimate patriotism." Nothing else reveals so fully the occasion for despair on the part of those oppressed, dependent and buffeted nationalities that have so long sought our shores and our aid, nor offers so good an argument for a new world state.

In return for her military strength, Italy was to receive the district of the Trentino; the entire Southern Tyrol; the city and suburbs of Trieste; Dalmatia and practically all the islands of the Adriatic, transforming this sea between Italy and Austria into an Italian Lake. This is the heart of the Jugo-Slav controversy, a union of states that must have outlets on the Adriatic. In the event that Albania, struggling for years for independence, should be formed into an autonomous, neutralized state, "Italy is obligated not to oppose the possible desire of France, Great Britain, and Russia to redistribute among Montenegro, Serbia and Greece the northern and southern districts of Albania." No mention whatever is made of Fiume.

In regard to the Near East, Italy stipulated that France, Great Britain and Russia should "recognize the interests of Italy, in preserving the political balance in the Mediterranean Sea, and also her right to receive, on the division of Turkey, an equal share with them in the basin of the Mediterranean." In speaking of this fact of Italy's persuasion, M. Felice Ferrero, Director of the Italian Bureau of Information, said, in a lecture in the

New York City College, July 17, 1918: "So far as Asia Minor is concerned, it is hardly fair to talk about Italian imperialism; it was not a case of concessions to Italy, but of a proposal to divide Asia Minor into four spheres of influence for England, France, Italy, and Russia," adding naïvely, "as France and England had nearly divided Africa between them."

In these secret treaties, Roumania, with unblushing frankness, acknowledges that "since the outbreak of the European war, Roumania had officially adopted a neutral attitude which inclined now to one, now to the other side, according to the course of military operations. This was based upon two main calculations: the wish not to arrive too late for the partition of Austria-Hungary, and the endeavor to earn as much as possible at the expense of the belligerents." Casting her lot finally with the Allies, she was to receive Bukovina and all Transylvania, though observing modestly, that these concessions "quite obviously did not correspond to the measure of Roumania's share of military operations."

After the perfidy of the separate peace with the Central Powers had been concluded, the report finds consolation in reflecting that a victorious Roumania would have been detrimental to her Ally, Russia! "A very strong State would have arisen in the Balkans consisting of Moldavia, Wallachia, Roumania, and Transylvania, with a population of

about 13,000,000." This state could hardly have been friendly disposed toward Russia, it asserts, and would scarcely have abandoned the design of realizing its national dreams in Bessarabia and the Balkans. "Consequently the collapse of Roumania's plans as a Great Power is not particularly opposed to Russia's interests. The circumstances must be exploited by us in order to strengthen for as long as possible those compulsory ties which link Russia with Roumania."

In the event of her immediate entry in the war in aid of Serbia, Greece was promised the Southern portion of Albania and important territorial acquisitions on the coast of Asia Minor. Venizelos, the distinguished foreign minister, "demanded in return a sure guarantee from Roumania against an attack upon Greece." This guarantee was not given by Roumania. Consequently, Greece gave no help to Serbia, and the offer lapsed. Later, attractive proposals were made to Greece "in the event of her entering against Turkey."

In the light of the Russian Revolution, and particularly of its repudiation of aggression, no secret document is more interesting than the state papers of Russia. Russia was to be granted Constantinople, the Straits, and portions of Asia Minor bordering on the Black Sea, with neighboring islands. In return she affirmed her readiness "to grant to France and England complete freedom in fixing the limitations of the western German

boundary, depending that the Allies in their turn will grant to us freedom in fixing our boundaries with Germany and Austria. . . . The question of forcing Germans out of Chinese markets is of great importance, but as its solution is impossible without the co-operation of Japan, it is preferable to submit it for discussion at an economic conference at which Japan will be represented."

France was to receive Syria; Alsace and Lorraine were to be returned, particularly "the whole of the industrial iron basin of Lorraine and the whole of the industrial coal basin of the Valley of the Saar." The German provinces on the left bank of the Rhine were also to be annexed and included in French territory.

England was to receive Mesopotamia and Bagdad, the German goal, and "the inclusion within her sphere of influence of the Persian neutral zone created by the treaty of 1907 between England and Russia."

German treaties are not yet available. But a secret telegram from the Russian Chargé d'Affaires at Berne, October, 1917, reveals prophetically the merciless German policy toward Russia. Germany's aim was "to promote separatism in Russia so far as possible, in order to split her up into small states," because, "for Germany it will be easy to conclude commercial treaties with weaker states, (Lithuania, Courland, etc.), because. . . . . "in a dismembered Russia, German industry and

trade will find work for a long time to come." It is unnecessary to read of German intentions toward revolutionary Russia. They are written upon the scroll of history and are the darkest blots on Germany's long black list.

The secret treaties have never been officially repudiated though public opinion has long since repudiated them. Their justification, when they have been scantly referred to by public officials, has been that annexation after war "was the custom. It was done" — which is perhaps, after all, all that can be said of them.

Is there hope that states, evolving from monarchial forms and long-trained in the school of predatory aims, will accept a democratic new world order? There is hope, if America will stand staunch, since the smaller nations of Europe have long stretched out their shackled hands to the great Western Democracy imploring its help to win freedom. There is hope because the large nations have traveled far in five years, and the way has been one of social liberation. England, before the war the greatest of world empires, since the war, in many respects, has become the greatest of social democracies, and is prepared to make further renunciations to cut the tangle which has so enmeshed states, making the way out so devious and difficult. France, too, a great republic that severed her serfdom to the principle of dynasty in the French Revolution, has since led the way to-

ward democracy, though hampered always by the propinquity of autocratic, militaristic states.

Under the protection of the League of Nations, for insecurity, these states are to exchange security. For competition they are asked to exchange co-operation; for imperialism they are asked to exchange a Democratic Association of Nations, or face internal rebellion, since peoples are at last awakening and insisting that small nations no longer be shuffled about like pawns upon a chess board, or exploited by modern economic states.

Whether or not the idea of empire is in time to be superseded by the idea of a League of Free Nations, as Mr. Wells suggests, may not be foretold. But it is certain that the group system of competing, sovereign states, as a means of maintaining social order, has failed, and that something else must be substituted.

In the perspective of history, it is not impossible that the Balance of Power will be regarded as the death-knell of dynasty, the swan song of kings. No forward-looking mind would dream of resurrecting it. In its place must arise a new world state founded upon industrial and political democracy. And America is the pathfinder to whom the great Powers themselves have turned for guidance in the untrod way.

Chapter IV.

AMERICA AND THE NEW ORDER.

"You that have gathered together the sons of all races,
And welded them into one,
Lifting the torch of your Freedom on hungering faces
That sailed to the setting sun;

"You that have made mankind in your own proud regions
The music of man to be,
How should the old earth sing of you, now, as your legions
Rise to set all men free?"

— *The Union* — Alfred Noyes.

WITHOUT America, European writers tell us, there can be no successful League of Nations. "What might have been too difficult without this unexpected aid may now be feasible," says H. N. Brailsford in his *League of Nations*. The idea of an association of power, as has been said, is not new. The freshness and vitality that is given the plan to-day, Mr. Brailsford asserts, come from the new fact in world politics: the discarding of the policy of American isolation; the declaration that "What affects mankind is inevitably our affair" and the entrance of the United States into a European war. Heretofore, this political writer states, the American mind was not content to disapprove of war; it barely understood it. Even able men, he

maintains, were unable to interpret Europe's international life, "dominated as it is by the idea of force and power." To-day, the new fact in the world's history is that "for the first time a Great Power with a formidable Navy, a population from which vast armies might be raised, and an economic and financial strength which might alone be decisive in any future conflict, is prepared to stake its own peace, not merely to guarantee its own interests, nor to further the partisan aim of its allies, but also to make an end in the world of prosperous aggression. Whatever may be its fate as a constructive proposal, this American offer marks an epoch on the world's moral evolution. . . . . We all know what a tragic failure we have made of the adventure of international life. Despairing of our own ability to surmount the accumulated hatred and distrust of our past, we look to the Republic to extricate us. . . . A policy of trust, with America to back it, ceases to be an idealistic folly."

Every American must feel a new pride of country, a new quickening of devotion to the ideals upon which America was founded, and a deeper determination not to fail in trustworthiness, as he reads such words. What are these ideals that America is asked to share? If Germany were upon the Western Hemisphere with America's man-power and resources, we know that the oppressed nationalities of Europe would not look

to her for liberation. It is not alone the fact that geographically this continent is three thousand miles distant from Europe; that America has no local European interest, no wish for territory, no embarrassing alliances to entangle or vise-like traditions to uncoil, that engenders a Western faith in us. America stimulates reliance among oppressed peoples because a century and a half ago she, herself, had the courage to break away from monarchial traditions to found a new government based upon the abstract ideal of human rights. American women should bear in mind that this country is appealed to because it, itself, is working out, with falterings and backslidings, but still with an unalterable purpose, the great effort of self-determination: the effort to replace the principle of dynasty with the principle of democracy; the effort to create a state in which the people, and not the officials, shall determine their destiny and the form of their institutions. This is the idea — though no one claims that America is completely fulfilling it. "A man's reach must exceed his grasp," and the autocratic principle of the ages is not to be overcome in a century. The institutions of the United States, nevertheless, as Viscount Bryce points out in *The American Commonwealth,* "disclose and display the type of institution toward which, as by a law of fate, the rest of civilized mankind are forced to move, some with swifter, others with slower, but all with

unresting feet." In the light of the war and the eminence of American influence in the settlement, these words, written many years ago, have a strangely prophetic ring.

What is the heritage of America toward which the civilized universe is moving and which the oppressed nationalities of Europe desire even as they desired our armament and our brave men? As we endeavored to visualize the old regime from which Europe is slowly emerging, that we might quicken the nature of our co-operation, so we must turn to our Colonial history and look into that Cradle of Liberty, the American Revolution, to glimpse more fully the new order of government to which these United States are committed, and to comprehend more clearly the character of American institutions which America is called upon to share.

If time were available to trace the outlines of the Balance of Power, we would see that the modern sovereign state system had been greatly stimulated, in its idea of Colonial expansion, by the discovery of America. Here were great virgin tracts of territory offering Europe unbounded dreams of Western Empire. Here the French and English conflict, surging in Europe, was reflected in a struggle between the French and English provinces for colonial predominance; and here the thirteen young Colonies, building a new life upon the Atlantic sea-board, far removed from courts

and intrigues, dared to think of themselves not as subjects, but as citizens, dared to dream new ideals of the national federation that is a forerunner of that world federation which ultimately must be.

In character and quality this new civilization discarded nearly every European tradition. It was a society, for instance, made up of "untitled humanity" — a society that thought so little of worldly rank and station as an essential of human elevation that it incorporated in its Constitution the principle: "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States; and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign state." To the Colonists, courts could not honor the man; character was the insignia of nobility, and

> "There was but one society on earth,
> The noble living and the noble dead."

It was a society also that deliberately rejected the tradition of militarism, maintaining but a small army and prizing above all its other advantages "the security which permits it to escape the barracks and the taxes of Europe."

Before the daring young provinces could put their individualistic, revolutionary doctrines into practise, it was necessary that they should first

dislodge from their shores the two greatest colonizing powers.

The French and Indian War, in 1763, in which England united with the Colonies to drive the French out of Canada, gave the Colonists a new confidence in their own powers, showed them their common interests, offered a school for training officers — Washington, Gates, Gage, and Mercer — that was to be invaluable later, and suggested that they could live even without British assistance. When the war of '76 broke out, after a series of oppressions upon the part of George III, (of Teuton blood!) it is well to remember that it did not originate as a war of Independence, but as a war of rebellion. Loyalty to the Mother Country was deep-rooted and strong. From the first Colonial Congress, in 1774, Washington wrote that "Independence was not desired by any thinking man in America." But in the spring of '76, this same conservative, after repeatedly frustrated appeals to England for justice, wrote: "Reconciliation is impossible. Nothing but independence will save us." Unjust taxation and navigation laws, writs of assurance, the Stamp Act, all made life increasingly unbearable. "The Colonies were regarded as trading corporations rather than as political bodies," writes President E. Benjamin Andrews, formerly of Brown University. "It was taken for granted that a colony was inferior to the Mother Country and was to be managed in the

interests of the commercial classes at home." Economic forces again turned the tide of history and launched the young Republic of America upon the sea of Democracy.

The victory over Cornwallis, in 1781, gave the Colonies independence, but presented a political problem that was not solved for a decade and which nearly disrupted the future of the young revolutionary states — the problem of federation.

At the outbreak of the war, the thirteen Colonies were practically sovereign, self-governing commonwealths, receiving their governors and their charters, for the most part, from the Crown. Of national unity there was little. The first Continental Congress, in 1774, was an effort to organize the Colonies' common resistance. In July, '76, in the midst of the Revolutionary War, after much discussion, this Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence, an act so radical that Benjamin Franklin said to the rebel delegates who had signed: "Now we must hang together or we shall hang separately!" This immortal paper established forever the principle that in order to secure inalienable rights, "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" — the very essence of the principle of self-determination.

In '77, still in war time, the Congress drew up the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union," under which the thirteen states, as they

now called themselves, formed a "firm League of Friendship." These Articles endured, loosely, for about ten years after the war until the Federal Constitution was drawn up and adopted, a period in which the young Union nearly met shipwreck. No Federal executive had been created, no proper Federal Judiciary had been provided, and Congress could neither collect revenues nor enforce its laws. Each state was sovereign, jealous, lawless, and the Articles of Confederation proved, as Washington declared, "no better than anarchy."

In 1787 a Convention met at Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Federation. Finally, after sitting five months, an entirely new Constitution was drafted which has since been considered the bulwark of American prosperity. It was to come into effect as soon as nine states had ratified it, and was eventually ratified, although Virginia and New York did not sign until the middle of '88, and North Carolina and Rhode Island, the latter always rebellious, at first refused to enter the new Union, consenting a year later, after the Federal Government had come into operation. This Constitution has been called the first new instrument in government in a thousand years and it is interesting to note that it was subject to every criticism made against the covenant of a League of Nations to-day.

The chief source of opposition to the Constitution among the Colonists was the fear that "sove-

reignty" and the hard-won liberty, both of the state and the individual, would vanish, and that "the freedom rescued at the hands of George III would perish at the hands of her own children." Another criticism, amusing to those who to-day find the Constitution restricting and conservative, was its extreme radicalism! It was new. It was untried, and, as usual, there were many who preferred bad but familiar old ways rather than idealistic, new paths that led they knew not where.

Even Patrick Henry was terrorized by the "revolutionary character" of the document, and demanded to know by what right the Convention spoke the language of "We the people" instead of "We the States."

Not even an American, says Bryce, can appreciate the political difficulties that confronted the Fathers. "The Convention had not only to create *de novo,* on the most slender basis of pre-existing national institutions, a national government for a wide-scattered people, but they had in doing so to restrict the fears and jealousies and apparently unreconcilable interests of thirteen separate commonwealths, to all of whose governments it was necessary to leave a sphere of action wide enough to satisfy a deep-rooted local sentiment, yet not so wide as to imperil national unity."

In spite of these difficulties, the Constitution remains what its authors styled it, eminently an instrument of compromise, yet ranking "above

every other written constitution for the intrinsic excellence of its scheme," a scheme that has passed safely through a century that has "radically altered every other civilized government." Yet, whatever its shortcomings, it remains an instrument that transformed confused and disordered states into a nation with Executive, Judicial and Legislative bodies that have since functioned and maintained solidarity more or less successfully.

In the diffusion of authority given by the Constitution, the question as to where sovereignty in reality dwells has never been definitely settled, though the idea that the Union was purely voluntary and that the whole people had no right to enforce it against the will of any particular state was settled by the Civil War. Theoretically, the novelty of the new government was that it rested upon "popular" sovereignty. The government was to derive its authority directly from the people, which is the democratic as opposed to the autocratic ideal. "And this authority, too, was not surrendered to the government, but simply — and this only in part — intrusted to it as the temporary agent of the sovereign people, who remained throughout the exclusive source of political power."

The problem of Colonial federation in the United States is acknowledged to be of special interest to-day, since its construction is most often spoken of as a model for World Federation. The object of the Constitution, we must recall, was to unite the

Colonies, provide for the common defense, and to give them concentrated power. Its purpose was to originate a central, super-authority that would regulate the activities of the States in their relation to each other, but not restrict their internal activities; in short, to create a national government, and to relate the States as well as the individual citizen to it.

The problem of World Federation is, in many respects, similar. It is the problem of uniting widely separated states, providing for their common defense, giving concentrated, democratic power. Its purpose should be to create a central, super-national authority that will regulate the conduct of sovereign states in their relationship to each other, but not restrict their internal activities; in short to create an *International* government, and to relate the nations and the individual citizens to it.

How is this colossal feat to be brought about? How, we may ask, have other federations been made practical?

In America, we have seen that federation followed in the wake of a great common danger which united the Colonies and proved to them that their interests were in reality one. In Germany and in Italy, federation was precipitated by the disruption of the Napoleonic campaigns, sweeping Europe, and the still greater danger to autocratic power of the French Revolution. In other words, in all cases, *fear* has prompted federation and

induced jealous, warring provinces to sink their differences, forego a measure of their sovereignty, subordinate individual ambitions, and unite for their common weal. Bismarck, an aristocrat, with face firmly set against Republican doctrines, was well aware of this principle of unification through fear, and used it subtly for his own purposes when he made the creation of the modern German Empire the supreme work of his life; his greatest difficulty, it is said, lying in persuading the small sovereign states to abrogate their right to declare war.

In considering world federation, the tendency seems to be to emphasize the difficulties of federation to such an extent that we lose sight of the advantages. Yet federation offers benefits, substantial and real, else would not sovereign states ever have consented to unite. These advantages are economic as well as political. In the cases of both Germany and Italy, as well as the American provinces, we have seen that a common danger led men to bury their difficulties and find fundamental agreements for their common advantage. At the back of all federation must lie self-interest, and it is not too much to say that this feature, alone, imparts genuine hope for eventual world federation.

Self-interest is not necessarily selfish interest. If it effect the entire body politic it may be altruistic interest as well. The war of 1914 has proved war

to be a common world danger. The safety of one state has been demonstrated to lie in the safety of all. No state is so small that it has not been made to feel more bitterly its own insecurity. No state is so large that its power has been untouched. And no state is so secure that it may ever again stand alone. The advantages of combination as well as the difficulties must be more often sounded, for large and small nations alike. In world federation, above all other federations, it must be pointed out, it is true that in union there is strength, in union there is power and efficiency, in union there is peace — if the Great Powers will it!

For the fate of world peace lies in the hands of the three great democracies that have won the war — England, France and the United States. This distinction is not intended to under-rate the splendid services of Russia before the Revolution, when she is said to have lost 5,000,000 men, or of Italy after her wonderful recovery from the vicious Austrian-German assault. It is but to state a fact. "The preservation of world peace," says Mr. Wells in *The League of Free Nations,* "rests with the great powers and with the great powers alone. If they have the will for peace, it is peace. If they have not, it is conflict." Some writers, like Professor George Louis Beer, in *The English-Speaking Peoples,* have narrowed this responsibility to England and America, claiming that they, alone, have the power to maintain social order.

However true this may be, special alliances under any circumstances are not advisable, since the end to be desired is not domination by two or more powerful states but a voluntary co-operation of all states. There is something of poetic justice in the fact that these three great nations, separated once because of the compelling tides of democracy, are now drawn together through the compelling triumph of democracy and that in their mutual loyalty will lie the fate of the world that is to be.

America is asked to share world responsibility, however, not to dominate it. She is asked to play exactly the part that her past has fitted her to play.

After winning her independence for nearly one hundred and fifty years the young stripling among nations withdrew into semi-isolation, as nations and individuals with a destiny to fulfil must withdraw to formulate ideals and principles.

Before the Revolutionary War, America may be said to have been in her infancy, learning to lisp the alphabet of Democracy. After the War she became of age and entered the period of young manhood when purpose and performance ignite and fuse. The European war of 1914 — a whirlpool that reached across the Atlantic and sucked into its currents the lives of American citizens — marks the period of the beginning of her maturity and her entrance as a co-leader in the larger affairs of the world.

The American experiment in democracy has become something more than "an adventure in the rule of the multitude."

America, at least, is mature enough, is experienced enough, to give and to take counsel. And the best way to learn a doctrine oneself is to attempt to teach it to some one else.

To ask America to go back to her pre-war isolation is like asking the stout youth to return to his knickerbockers. It cannot be done without stultifying the laws of growth as well as denying the bonds of our common humanity.

Fortunately, when the hour of the world strain arrived, American interests were guarded by a wise councilor entrenched in home traditions. As Americans, absorbed in developing the new Eldorado, many patriots, even, had become careless of their heritage of imperishable riches — the incorruptible principles of liberty on which our nation was founded. Before 1917 little respect was shown for our symbols or national emblems. When the war broke out, for instance, it became necessary to teach our citizens to salute the flag! When I wished for a copy of the Declaration of Independence — being removed from my books — I sought six houses, each priding itself upon being 100 per cent American, before finding a copy of this most important of our state papers. Its message is memorized in our youth and then forgotten. We do not enshrine it in our hearts or our homes.

President Wilson did not make this error. It was easy for him to recall the principles that forged American Independence because he had long lived with these principles. Freedom and justice were familiar to him because daily he looked into their eyes. In his chosen profession he dealt with human liberties as other men deal with weights and measures, or stocks and bonds. As a youth he studied history; as a young man he taught history; in early maturity he wrote history, and when the hour of the world's doom knocked at his door, he was able to make history. Thus, and thus only, do circumstances fit us for our task.

From the beginning of the war, President Wilson saw the destiny of America, even as a great neutral, looming large. From the beginning, his own viewpoint was international. He saw the great powers as a family of nations that ultimately must organize their interests. From the historic aspect there could be no other view. His first public sanction of a League of Nations was before the League to Enforce Peace, in 1916, when he declared that he believed the United States was ready "to become a partner in any feasible association of nations formed to control aggression."

On January 8, 1918, in stating before Congress the War Aims and Peace Terms of the United States, he placed a League of Nations as the last of his fourteen famous principles in the program of the World's Peace.

On September 27th, 1918, in his Liberty Loan Speech in New York, Mr. Wilson featured the constitution of a League of Nations first as the "most essential part of the peace settlement itself."

Again, he defined the issues of world peace, issues not temporary but eternal since they must always form the foundation of justice in governments. They deal entirely with human liberties.

"Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force?

"Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest?

"Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice?

"Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations, or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress?

"Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance, or shall there be a common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?"

It is significant that no one of these issues quoted but might have been uttered over one hundred years ago by the small band of subject people on the

American coast as they, too, sought independence. In the mind of America's leader, the issues of this war would seem to be inseparably interwoven with the principles upon which America was founded, the principles of Democracy which must indeed underlie all just deliverances. It is not improbable that the Liberty Loan Speech stating these issues will take its place with America's foremost documents of emancipation. The Declaration of Independence freed a struggling people. The Emancipation Proclamation freed an enslaved race. But the Liberty Loan Speech of 1918 enunciated principles that gave hope to an oppressed and enshackled world.

In the light of the past and in the glow of those eternal fires in which were cast the principles of Americanism, it would seem as if the mission of these United States would envisage itself to the United States as one of unquestioned political liberation, equally as important for chaotic Europe as military liberation. What has proved beneficent for America, America would freely extend to other repressed nationalities, guaranteeing, on other shores, that freedom so often sought upon her own — so logical, so almost fatalistic does the part which America, herself once oppressed and dependent, must play in the larger destiny of the world. That this destiny should be obscured at home, that this program for democratic world peace through world justice should not only be

questioned but also opposed at home, shows how far the sons may stray from the purposes of the fathers.

The idea of a League of Nations is not a party issue. It is a world issue. It is not a local palliative. It is world reconstruction. Whether its program be sketched by Republican or Democratic intelligence is immaterial. What is material is that its outlines contain the framework of constructive, organized peace, and that the program itself should command the allegiance of all citizens who sincerely wish for permanent peace irrespective of political creed. Yet its principles have been attacked and made the basis of a bitter attempt to divide the nation.

A man may endure defeat and the denial of his principles. But may a nation? Every nation of Europe has been looking to America for salvation. Every war-weary people has been sustained in the long conflict by the thought that America was to be the creator and guarantor of the new world's freedom. Forever to put down war, to end militarism, to establish Democracy — this was the idealism that America pledged to the Universe when she entered the war. Is America to be victorious upon the battle field and defeated upon the field of political honor and fidelity to trust? As we found it necessary to present a unified and successful military front, so it is even more essential that we bury our political differences and present

a unified political front before Europe if America is to redeem her promissory note to the world and peace is to cease being a feather blown by every devastating wind.

We cannot ask ourselves too often: What has America concretely to offer to Europe — Europe with her historic grandeur, Europe with her dazzling crown jewels and her purple robes of state? America may not boast. She wears no diadem, but in spite of some small sins of aggression, America has also her virtues, and in this critical hour may be pardoned if she enumerate them, not, indeed, to laud her past but to stimulate her future.

America has the precepts of Washington, who warned against entangling alliances, but who, in this new day, would be the first to see that "only special and limited alliances entangle," and that the times demand the support of "a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understandings and the maintenance of common rights;" of President Monroe, who formulated forever a principle of no aggression on American shores, a principle whose banners must be emplanted on all soil; of Lincoln, who dedicated himself to liberty and died that freedom might live.

America has a tradition of peace to offer common to no other country: one hundred years of peace with England and a great boundary line between

the United States and Canada, fortified only with good will; over one hundred years of peace with France, and a war with Spain in which we went into her neighboring island of Cuba, did our work, and withdrew. America has her own tradition of the modern way to acquire territory: the Louisiana purchase, under Jefferson, the great tract of land bought of Napoleon after he was obliged to relinquish his dream of extending the French Empire to American shores; the purchase of Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000 in 1867, and of the Phillipines from Spain in 1902 in spite of the fact that they might have been claimed, according to John Hay, as a conquest of war after Admiral Dewey's victory. We have one example, at least, of declination to enter the circle of financial imperialism when the United States refused to be one of the Six Powers to put through the Chinese Loan — a preliminary to partition — and saved ourselves from the "dollar diplomacy" that advocated the loan even in our own land.

Time and the clamor of great events have somewhat dimmed the character of our origin, the gaunt outlines of our revolt against injustice. But these outlines remain to guide us to-day when America has passed from weakness to strength, from poverty to riches, from a debtor to the great creditor nation. America has everything to offer. What has America to fear?

America must be guarded against her own

prosperity, her own success; and this success is twofold: success in industry and success in arms. From the Junker within her gates; from the subtle temptations of Power; from the American militarist and the American imperialist, out for the markets of the world and determined to have the army and the navy to enforce economic domination, the American people must pray and work for deliverance. Herein lies the lurking American danger — the modern Goliath that the young David of Internationalism must slay if American ideals are to endure and the new world state is to be made safe and free for all.

The honor of America is in the hands of American women as well as American men. They, too, are the daughters of freemen, the recipients of a great heritage and the custodians of a great trust. They, too, cannot recall too often the outlines of their inheritance. The mantle of their privileges is worn so ordinarily that they sometimes forget that these privileges are not yet assured to other women and other nations. They are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness — all prerogatives blasted by the hot breath of war.

Women must end war. Sooner or later this giant task of the ages must dawn upon all women and create solidarity. And in initiating this enterprise, the American woman, so long recognized for her independence and initiative, must play a leading

rôle. As the pallid hands of overrun nations are stretched out to her, the American woman must visualize the great human needs of nations and stand, like a Goddess of Liberty, over her representatives to insist that America offer to the stricken nations only the best gifts that America has to bestow. Nothing else will serve. These gifts are idealism, freedom, democracy; democracy to the utmost, democracy without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant democracy that shall prove that America is not the custodian of this or that special interest, but of the ideal of Liberty itself.

"If drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe —
Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the law —
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget — lest we forget."

Chapter V.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AN ESSENTIAL OF WORLD FEDERATION.

"The day of autocracy in industry is dead."

THE peace of the world may be disturbed in a variety of ways. There is industrial and civil war as well as political and international war, and women interested in promoting permanent peace must give their attention to the labor problem that is tearing at the heart of society to-day, realizing that industrial peace is a fundamental of any genuine world peace. It will profit the world little if there is harmony among states and widespread dissatisfaction within.

To build a world upon political democracy alone, however universal, however just its principles, and to overlook the crying need in every state for democratic adjustment in industry with reference to the growing need of the workers, is like building a house one half upon terra firma and the other half over a flaming pit. The house will suffer from two directions — not only from the flames below

NOTE. — Since this Chapter was written events have moved so rapidly that conditions have become somewhat altered. But the principles of the Chapter have not altered, and so I have allowed it to remain. — F. G. T.

that are bound to reach and devour it, but also from the disintegration of its own hastily adjusted, unsound parts.

The great war is not entirely responsible for the social conflagration that is sweeping Europe to-day, the excess and chaos that mark the death of old orders, the travail and labor pains that inevitably accompany the birth of new social forms. Long before the war the world was in the throes of a world-wide industrial revolution, tearing at civilization in the great industrial centers. The old autocracies have paid dearly for their blindness in not recognizing the processes of economic evolution that have long clamored for recognition. Will the democracies of Europe who are to mold the future remain equally blind? Will they fail to recognize that the people of Central and Eastern Europe have overthrown their rulers, not that they might gain political power as such, but that they might have political power as the means of improving their own intolerable economic conditions; power at the top to improve unspeakable living conditions at the bottom? In Russia, for instance, we see the industrial revolution in its most acute form. The workers of Russia cared little for the form of government under which they lived, once the symbol of oppression was overthrown. They were interested, primarily, in establishing direct contacts with the people that would assure them every-day human necessities —

the necessity, above all, for food and land. It is a working class revolution, an industrial revolution, because no one but the working class knew the sufferings and the horrors of life for the workers well enough to institute remedies — remedies not satisfactory to Western intelligence, perhaps, but which, according to the principle of self-determination, must be worked out by the sufferers themselves.

The conditions in Russia, punishment with the knout, the solitude of Siberia, the illiteracy and privations of 93 per cent. of the people, fortunately are not repeated in civilized countries. But some form of industrial ferment exists everywhere, even in "free America," and must exist until every government recognizes the fact that society has entered a new era, the era of mechanical genius, when great mastodon machines belch forth an almost incredible product, now widely distributed, but where the profits resulting from this product have not been democratized and widely distributed. Until society acknowledges these facts and adjusts itself to them, balancing distribution with production, democratizing the rules of the great modern industrial game, each country must be like the Spartan who concealed the fox under his coat and was rewarded by having his vitals consumed.

What must a League of Nations do about this greatest question of the future, the stilling of industrial discontent, if universal war is not to be

followed by universal anarchy and the sacrifices shall not have been made in vain?

It would seem first of all that in some way it must overcome the first error of the Peace Congress — the scanty representation of labor at the Peace Board, its almost entire failure to recognize either men or women loyal war-workers. Here was an ideal chance to make a "different" peace. Here was a magnificent opportunity to demonstrate the beginning of that world democracy for which we are said to have fought by extending to women and to organized labor a dignified and direct representation from each state. Here was the opportunity to institute the beginning of those industrial parliaments that should characterize an industrial age. True democracy can hardly be expected from diplomats who know little of the needs of everyday humanity and whose training and sympathy are necessarily along the lines of their own caste, men too far removed from the whirring wheels of industry to be expected to heed this new cry of the people that the standard of life shall be raised. But the cry must be heard and heeded, nevertheless, or society must suffer the consequences.

The first essentials are for labor commissions on which shall sit men and women of a comprehensive sympathy from both ranks of labor — the employer and the employed. These commissions should not be spasmodic — a mere aftermath of war — but

they should form permanent foundations of peace. The need is for men who will see that, even as the corroding influence of the Balance of Power and the irritant of rival alliances and Ententes had to pass and be buried forever, so an industrial system that would concentrate the overwhelming fruits of modern industry narrowly in the hands of the few is also ephemeral and must be given God-speed; that as slavery and the feudal system passed, so human exploitation, in the great steam-and-piston period of life when production is a widely co-operative process, must also be discarded and give way to a wider conception of the distribution of profits. And secondly, we want commissions that will apply the same unflinching democratic principles to industry that have been outlined as applying to nationalities — the stern principles of justice — "justice to those to whom we wish to be just and justice to those to whom we do not wish to be just" — if harmony is to be secured internally in the "workaday world" and a League of Nations is to be established that is not to be distrusted by the very people whom it is created to protect.

Reduced to a minimum, the task of delegates forming the new world state seems to be a twofold vision of the immediate and pressing necessities, not only for society as a whole but also for its individual units. For both the supreme need is, as we have said, the establishment of internal

harmony in the states as a condition precedent to establishing international confidence and social stability, a harmony not to be gained by going back to pre-war conditions, notoriously inadequate, but by going forward to create new forms of co-operation to satisfy the social hunger of humanity to-day; forms, as Lord Cecil recently said, that are not to be evolved merely by raising wages and shortening hours, but are to be created by elevating workers to an interest in industry itself, thus establishing the beginnings of orderly industrial democracy.

It might be well to define here what is meant by industrial democracy. Political democracy, we agree, concentrates sovereignty in the hands of the majority, the people themselves, who have the right to choose their officials and make the laws under which they live. It asserts, "that peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the Balance of Power."

Industrial democracy includes the same principles applied to the workers. Industrial democracy implies that control in industry be diffused in the hands of the workers and not in a few autocratic heads; that the time has come when it must be recognized that labor is not a commodity to be bought and sold, bartered about, but that it must be allowed to determine its own destiny; and more-

over that the profits of industry, democratically created, shall also be democratically shared; in short, that self-determination, for individuals as well as for nations, be the basis of the new world state.

It must indeed be an obtuse vision that refuses to see that the democratic control of industry, by the workers themselves, is the goal toward which all the countries in Europe now in the throes of revolution are tending, even as Viscount Bryce declared that the nations of the earth were moving toward American political institutions.

America is acknowledged to be the country to which the oppressed peoples of Europe are looking for help in gaining political freedom, since, in this sphere, American history and American idealism offer illuminating precedents. But for ideals of industrial democracy we do not look to America because, in this particular, America has not yet worked out principles of industrial leadership. For a world program of economic reconstruction we must go to the older country, England, the first country to inaugurate the factory system and the first country to establish the trades union — the collective method of correcting the evils of the factory system; England, the great Commonwealth of Nations, where class barriers are crumbling and from whom America, her foster child, has much to learn.

In England people discuss the labor question.

They do not merely denounce it. In England liberal opinion is respected even when it is opposed. In England we find varying degrees of opinion, such as Conservative, Liberal and Radical, recognized, listened to and respected even by those who differ. And it is this spirit of toleration and fair play that has kept the British Empire, a conglomeration of differing nationalities, among them a modern social democracy like Australia, as a League of Nations for many years.

In America, until recently, we found no such toleration. In America we found a great body of Conservative opinion with any departure branded as anarchistic — no middle ground of departure recognized as honest, constructive dissent. Yet the dissent exists — a minority opinion that, like a woman's love, will out, and if it cannot escape through the door, will find exit through every window and crack, to become, in many instances, the majority opinion of the future. In the matter of differing with zeal and yet with courtesy — the high-water mark of seasoned culture, in a nation or an individual — we are still youthful, still overbearing and crude, our most popular method of dealing with a minority expression being suppression. When our soap-box orators (Hyde Park is full of them) dare to question authority in Madison Square, we clap them into jail — thus attracting more sympathizers to their "cause" than if we had left them alone; and in the name of

liberty we restrict the people's civil liberties, then wonder at American unrest!

Closer international relationships may rub off much of this provincialism, this sensitiveness to dissent, as we clasp hands across the seas with older and more tolerant powers. But, until recently, liberal opinion in America was challenged, like our immigrants at Bedloe's Island, with the result that it was often deported, though the Statue of Liberty lifts a welcoming face at our gates. Collectively, we were like the Puritan mother who believed in social purity yet who refused to discuss the principles of social hygiene with her growing child.

Was it because we were not sure enough of ourselves that we could not trust a stimulating dissent in opinion? How can we believe that true progress may be made by casting the thoughts of 110,000,000 people into one mould, when our great Republic itself was founded by our immortal Apostles of Dissent?

To England, then, we must turn for an interpretation of industrial democracy: the one country whose liberalism seems likely to evolve ways and means of avoiding the class struggle which is rocking the continent of Europe to-day. There, we are told, it is recognized that the "age in which the classic system of parliamentary government was adequate has now drawn to its close and the center of political life has shifted to the single problem of making peaceful and advantageous the transi-

tion to a state in which labor will be the predominating element." This is not to say that England has not also its strong reactionary forces, business interests, great old landlords, retired colonels and navy men who are not only opposed to liberalism but whose highest sense of duty finds expression in keeping alive an expiring social state. Nevertheless it is to the British Empire with its politically active Labor Party that we must look for the most constructive plan of the future that the war has evolved.

The Right Reverend Cosmos Gordon Lang, Archbishop of York, whose visit so delighted Americans, in war time, somewhat prepared us for the great social changes that England has undergone in the furnace of war, and particularly for the ascendency of the British Labor Party. In an interview in the Magazine Section of the New York Times, the Archbishop said: "Having conquered the Germans we must conquer ourselves. The British Labor Party, which is developing with growing success the unification of the efforts of workers with the brain and with the hand, is working toward the condition when the industries will be controlled by the workers themselves, and this is only part of the great changes in the social and industrial scheme in Britain which are sure to come."

Of the Labor Party's famous Report, the Archbishop of York said: "The Labor Party's Mani-

festo naturally and rightly points out the full demands of labor in a reasonable way and represents the tendency toward which the movement may be directed. But beyond question, there are in the full program many features which could not be carried out at once without dislocating industry. The real problem, however, is that *employers must recognize the necessity of giving to the workman a larger share of the product of the industry and a greater share of control of the management of the industry.*" (The italics are mine.)

Can we imagine an American prelate speaking with such tender toleration of American dissenters and pronouncing "reasonable" a program of Liberal reconstruction that labor itself had evolved?

Occasionally we find an exception, a prophet and seer in the aristocracy of finance, some Captain of Industry closely enough in touch with industry not to make the error of under-rating it, some man of genius with imagination enough to glimpse a future where industrial and political democracy, the lion and the lamb of to-day, may lie down in peace and quiet together and allow the human race to start once more on its road to a more equalized progress. In Mr. Charles Schwab we find such an exception. (Must one come from the ranks oneself in order to understand labor's potential strength?) In speaking, recently, at a dinner, Mr. Schwab predicted, after the war, a new social era.

"We are facing a social situation," he said, "which we should be keenly alive to, a situation which is going to come at the close of the war, a social renaissance of the whole world. Call it socialism, social revolution, Bolshevism, or what you will, it is a leveling process and means that the workman without property, who labors with his hands, is going to be the man who will dominate the world. It is going to be a hardship to the owners of property, but like all revolutionary movements it will work for great good. The sooner we recognize this, the better it will be for America. We must not fight this movement, but we must educate it. We must go among the people and learn their feelings and thoughts." After reading the British Labor Party's comprehensive report, with its clear expression of human necessities, Mr. Schwab might have amended his remarks and added, "and be educated by it!"

When the searchlight of history is turned upon the social results of the great war, it will reveal two distinct programs of social reconstruction, coming from the two extremes of society and yet closely allied; the first, President Wilson's program of a concert of power, founded upon the rights of the smallest nationality, making up political democracy; and second, the program of the British Labor Party, founded on the democratic control of industry by the workers, outlining industrial democracy; two necessary halves of an essential

whole if the League of Nations is to be truly democratic and founded upon principles that will endure.

What is this "clarified common thought" whose tendency statesmen have been warned that they must follow or be broken? It is found in the two reports published by the British Labor Party, the one dealing with domestic reconstruction, the other with a program of international unity, after the dislocation of war.

The first report, Labor and the New Social Order, has been called the most important document since the Declaration of Independence, and is undoubtedly the Magna Charta of Labor. It should be in every thinking woman's hand and approached with an unprejudiced mind. For it is no longer a question before society of agreeing or disagreeing with the people's self-expressed idea of democracy, but of being informed of liberal opinion, the only middle ground of action between the two equally threatening forces of society to-day — the excesses of radicalism sweeping Europe on the one hand, and the excesses of conservatism trying to dominate public opinion and make progress backward, on the other.

In commenting on this report, the *New Republic* in a foreword said that "tentative as the document is, it is probably the most mature and carefully formulated program ever put forth by a responsible political party." And it warns the

American people that if they "are too limited, too blind, to admit a program of this kind, calmly discussing a problem far more acute than it was before the war, into serious political discussion," they will only "provoke and even justify a far more drastic and dangerous kind of agitation." For the social reconstruction proposed in the Report is not proposed by some little group of social reformers or anti-social revolutionists. It is proposed as the platform of one of the most powerful political parties in Great Britain, a party which co-operated loyally with the government to win the war.

The British Labor Party looks upon the problem of the reconstruction of society as a whole and has the advantage of looking from the bottom up, instead of from the top down, and seeing things silhouetted in clear light. "We need to beware of patchwork," it begins. "The view of the Labor Party is that what has to be reconstructed after the war is not this or that government department, or this or that piece of social machinery; but, so far as Britain is concerned, society itself." What this war has consumed, it maintains, "is not merely the security, the homes, the livelihood and the lives of millions of innocent families, and an enormous proportion of all the accumulated wealth of the world, but also the very basis of the peculiar social order in which it has arisen." The Labor Party does not pretend that it is possible, even after the drastic clearing away of old social débris during

the period of the war, that it is going to build society anew in a year or two of feverish construction. "What the Labor Party intends to satisfy itself about is that each brick that it helps to lay shall go to erect the structure that it intends and no other."

The four pillars of the House of To-morrow, resting upon the foundation of the democratic control of society in all its activities, are termed:

(a) The Universal Enforcement of the National Minimum;
(b) The Democratic Control of Industry;
(c) The Revolution in National Finance; and
(d) The Surplus Wealth for the Common Good.

Each one of these pillars is discussed in so comprehensive a manner, with the relation of each to the other so clearly defined, that to give extracts from the program is hardly fair to the subject or its authors. One must read the program as a whole to understand what, to the workers, is an orderly program of reconstruction to be won by the ballot and not by bullets, if society will co-operate.

If one may be permitted to attempt a resumé of the four principles — the first, the enforcement of a minimum wage, may be said to deal with the necessity for a living wage as "the only complete safeguard against that *insidious degradation of the standard of life,*" (the italics are mine, as appealing to women), "which is the worst economic and

social calamity to which any community can be subjected. We are members one of another. No man liveth to himself alone. If any, even the humblest, is made to suffer, the whole community and every one of us, whether or not we recognize the fact, is thereby injured." And the national minimum for England is fixed, for men and women alike, at the munificent sum of not less than thirty shillings a week!

(b) The Democratic Control of Industry affirms that, unlike the Conservative and Liberal parties, the Labor Party insists upon democracy in industry as well as in government. "What the Labor Party looks to is a genuinely scientific reorganization of the nations' industry, no longer deflected by private profiteering, on the basis of the common ownership of the means of production; the equitable sharing of the proceeds among all who participate in any capacity and only among these, and the adoption, in particular services and occupations, of those systems and methods of administration and control that may be found, in practice, best to promote the public interests." And it recommends the national ownership and control of the railroads, canals, posts, telegraphs, steamship lines and electrical plants, to be worked unhampered by private or purely local interests, exclusively for the common good.

(c) The Revolution in National Finance approves of the taxation of incomes above the

necessary cost of family maintenance, to liquidate the colossal debts of the war, and especially of the taxation of that "one-tenth of the population which owns nine-tenths of the riches of the United Kingdom," and which will, as a result of the war, "far from being made poorer, draw in rent and interest and dividends a larger nominal income than ever before." In this matter of taxation, the Labor Party claims the support of four-fifths of the whole nation, for it asserts that "the interests of the clerk, the teacher, the doctor, the minister of religion, the average retail shopkeeper and trader, and all the mass of those living on small incomes, are identical with those of the artisan."

(d) The Surplus for the Common Good.

"One main pillar of the house that the Labor Party intends to build is the future appropriation of the surplus, not to the enlargement of any individual fortune, but to the common good." This surplus is to be used "for the education alike of children, of adolescents and of adults, in which the Labor Party demands a genuine equality of opportunity, overcoming all differences of material circumstances; and for the organization of public improvements of all kinds, including the brightening of the lives of those now condemned to almost ceaseless toil, and a great development of the means of recreation." The workers, too, would work for the promotion of music, literature and fine art, which, they claim, have been "under capitalism so

greatly neglected, and upon which, so the Labor Party holds, any real development of civilization fundamentally depends. Society, like the individual, does not live by bread alone — does not exist only for perpetual wealth production."

When we consider that one source of wars is this same surplus and its more profitable investment in cheaper labor in foreign lands — the rivalry for opportunities of investment forming that over-seas imperialism which we are told leads to modern wars — we may see how important a factor a wider distribution of the "surplus" at home might be in the establishment of enduring peace.

Is the American mind capable of dismissing this program as distant and having no application to the Democracy called the United States? Such an attitude may no longer be feasible. American Labor, once timid and conservative, is taking on new life since the war. Enlightened, perhaps, by its war-time visit to the liberal-minded labor parties of France and England, and disappointed inevitably by President Wilson's failure to appoint a labor delegate to the Peace Table and fearful, too, lest its concessions won during the war may be lost in the disorder and reactions of peace, the American Federation of Labor in several cities has declared itself in favor of a separate political party with a platform quite as progressive as the British Labor Party report. From its first declaration for the democratic control of industry by the workers, to

its last plank for a League of free nations to establish international democracy, it breathes the new breath of life of economic independence for the workers that must be recognized as characteristic of the new day. "Among the American adherents of Toryism, this platform (of the Chicago Federation of Labor), and the others in New York, Ohio and California will be decried as rank Bolshevism," says the *New Republic* of December 7th, in commenting on the new Labor alignment. "With them every gospel of democratic progress is Bolshevism. As a matter of fact it is a most hopeful sign of the vital sanity of American Labor. In America as in England, the strongest bulwark against Bolshevism, the strongest guaranty of a reasoned advance toward economic and industrial democracy, is labor's capacity for independent political action."

Mr. H. M. Kallen, in his book on the League of Nations, predicted that over the peace table would loom a gigantic and fearful specter. The dictators of public opinion have decreed that this specter shall be called "Bolshevism." And he points out that after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815 there was a like specter looming over the Peace Table at Vienna. That specter was called "Democracy." And it is interesting to recall that so brilliant a founder of our republic as Alexander Hamilton feared and mistrusted this specter, this child of a new civilization. In the French Revolution he saw,

not the beginning of democracy, he saw only the frenzy of excess and anarchy; none of the chaos that means the breaking up of old forms of society in order that the new may break through. He distrusted the collective power of the people and himself a strong admirer of England's constitutional monarchy, would have preferred to see George Washington king.

Will Bolshevism, the political and economic specter of to-day, the sleeping giant of ages, lift its back in America and upset our cherished ideals of economic justice and social rights? For America, Mr. Kallen asserts, there is little danger, since "The individualistic character of life in America renders impossible that type of class unity, without which 'Bolshevism' is impotent." Perhaps this view is too optimistic. It is true that in America social lines are not so strictly drawn as in Europe, but the cleavages of wealth are even more acute. Much will depend upon the open-mindedness of the over-comfortable and the overfed; upon the attitude with which those who have will meet this new feature of to-day, the challenge of those who have not, a feature that must be met, faced and not side-stepped since it is as logical an outcome of the ideal of human freedom as is the ideal of political independence itself. The human spirit is out to cast off all forms of serfdom. It refuses to be politically emancipated and economically enslaved.

"The way to control your destiny is to work with it." And the way to control this spirit reaching out for economic freedom upon the part of the many is to work with it and apply to it, as we have said, those same broad principles which we have seen must be applied to other great issues of the day. Stern justice must settle this question for America as for England without disrupting the social state, and will if only we allow the warmth of the great events of the day to thaw the ice that has formed over so many of our static opinions; if only we break up our social ossifications and recognize that the old economic state, the state of 1913, is gone as inevitably as the lives are gone of the brave men who died on the battlefield of France, many of them, that industrial freedom itself might live.

And women! It is hardly possible to exaggerate their importance in solving the great industrial problems of to-day. Not merely by going into industry by the thousands as they already have gone and must continue to go even in the face of opposition — though the woman in industry is gradually helping men to elevate labor, could they but see it. But the well-to-do woman, who stands apart by the accident of chance from the world's toilers, the woman who supports suffrage and "causes," the woman who has never felt the pinch of poverty herself, may nevertheless by her intelligent co-operation, educate the public in the problem, and

elevate it to the rank of the humanities where it belongs. For the labor problem is not primarily a labor problem — a question of money and hours alone. It is a human problem, a question of the world's most precious capital — the stock of human lives. For back of every laborer stands a woman and little children. Back of every worker stands a "home," too often not worthy to be called by that name. When the pay envelope shrinks, it is the woman's heart that shrinks also, the woman who already has had difficulty in spreading the little over a large surface and who falters at attempting to do with less; it is the woman who suffers when the man is jobless, it is the women and children who grow pale and wan when the long, long strike is on. Error and selfishness undoubtedly exist on both sides of the balance in this great question since human nature has the same frailties, whether the stomach is empty or full. But it is the woman, no matter who is wrong, who always pays. Here, above all else, women must help women, and in helping women, work toward that great conservation of humanity that is the woman's part of life.

In the meantime the fact must be recognized. The people are on the march and though the march may be directed it may not with impunity be halted. The goal is industrial democracy. The workers demand that reconstruction give justice and freedom to dependent and oppressed individuals as well

as justice and self-determination to dependent and oppressed states. To federate upon anything less is to invite and to perpetuate social chaos. Nothing less will establish a true world democracy, or make the degree of democracy we now possess in reality safe.

Chapter VI.

PROGRAMS OF WORLD PEACE.

"Justice needs that two shall be heard." — Goethe.

THE time has not yet arrived to write a history of the origin of the League of Nations, nor of the source of its many world programs. It is sufficient to say that on the outbreak of the war thoughtful minds everywhere began to question how a like calamity in the future might be avoided. The formation of a League of Nations to prevent war was so logical, so inevitable a step in the evolution of nations that programs for a League began to spring up spontaneously in many countries and places. It is possible to indicate here only a few of these American and European outlines, giving the programs themselves in an appendix at the end of the chapters.

As the United States for three years was not in the war and consequently was not absorbed, as were France and Great Britain, in war problems, it was possible for this country to take immediate steps towards organization for propaganda in behalf of world peace. The best known American organization for this purpose is the League to

Enforce Peace. This society took form in Independence Hall in Philadelphia in June 1915, Mr. William Howard Taft being chosen as President, and about three hundred statesmen, professors and international lawyers being present.

In commenting on the origin of the Platform of the League to Enforce Peace, Mr. William H. Short, Secretary of the League says: "It is not the proposal of a single man or company of men. Representative groups of statesmen and publicists, here and abroad, held conferences on the subject through periods covering many months, the conclusions of which, when made public, were in practical agreement. . . . This spontaneity gives it an inevitable character and significance which guarantee its wisdom and timeliness." In the fall of 1918 the League to Enforce Peace adopted a Victory Program endorsing President Wilson's plan.

The first annual conference of the new League was held in Washington in May, 1916. It was at a dinner of this convention that President Wilson made his first public utterance of sympathy with the idea of a universal association of nations to maintain public order. In speaking of the far-reaching effects of the European war he said: "We are not mere disconnected onlookers. . . . We are participants, whether we would or not, in the life of the world. The interests of all nations are our own also. We are partners with the rest.

What affects mankind is inevitably our affair as well as the affair of the nations of Europe and of Asia." He then indicated the necessity of the substitution of "conference for force" and added: "It is clear that nations must in the future be governed by the same high code of honor that we demand of individuals."

President Wilson then formulated the three fundamentals of government that should unite nations in a common cause. They were "first, that every people has the right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. Second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon. And, third, that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression and disregard of the rights of peoples and nations."

The effect of this speech made before an American association founded to promote world peace, was electric especially among small and oppressed nationalities in Europe, and by virtue of his position as President of the American Democracy, Mr. Wilson from that time on became the chief exponent of the League of Nations idea.

With the entrance of President Wilson into the arena of world politics something new was contributed to the realm of international thinking. It is to be noted in the fact that the President dwells

lightly on the idea of international armies forming a common police force. President Wilson has seen deeper into the problem of federated peace, and has shown us how futile any machinery of enforcement will be that does not rest primarily upon international righteousness and good will. Not all the machinery law can create, not all the judges nations may summon, can keep the world peace between nations that do not trust each other. And the way to cultivate mutual trust is not by an appeal to common interest, since "interests separate and do not unite," but by an appeal to devotion to duty and to the right. President Wilson, in short, has appealed to the common conscience of mankind, and by the wideness of that appeal has awakened the international conscience. Backed by this common conscience, Mr. Wilson has formulated a new code of group ethics, of group morality between states, and his name will stand or fall in history according to his power to compel nations to accept his vision of collective morality, his statutes of a new world creed founded upon international justice rather than upon material power.

His own Fourteen Points were formulated in an address to Congress stating the War Aims and Peace Terms of the United States, delivered on January 8th, 1918.

In speaking of the President's Program, Walter Lippmann, Secretary to the Special Committee of

Inquiry organized by Col. E. M. House to prepare data for the Peace Conference, said: "The Fourteen Points were written at a particular time to meet the situation at that time, and it was something of a political accident that they constituted the basis of the armistice which Germany was permitted to sign. The accident was that the Allies had never issued any substitute for them. They won by default, so to speak. They were rushed in to fill the vacuum in Allied diplomacy which had been created by the sudden collapse of the war."

Of the origin of the Fourteen Points, Mr. Lippmann said: "They were not intended to score an original hit or to display any one man's ingenuity and novelty of mind. They were deliberately assembled, pieced together and arranged out of the thousand and one programs and claims which were agitating Europe. The object of the Fourteen Points was to find a common body of doctrine upon which the democracies of the world could unite. They were not a complete program of international action." They were issued after the Brest-Litovsk parleys in answer to a challenge from the Central Empires as to what sort of settlement their adversaries would deem just and satisfactory. President Wilson spoke for America as Mr. Lloyd George had spoken the previous week for the people and Government of Great Britain.

Stern justice underlies each and all of President

Wilson's Fourteen Points. "Unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us," he asserted when he gave his fundamental principles for a new world order. Some of these principles have come to pass; others will require the slow educative process of time. Poland, the buffer state between Russia and Germany — the state whose control Bismarck said was vital to the German Empire, the state which has suffered three partitions in the royal game of aggression — has been declared free; the independence of the Czecho-Slovac republic has been recognized, and the Jugo-Slavs have united to form a Republic of the Southern Balkan States. But the Fourteen Points are not, nevertheless, "antiquated" since they were accepted as the basis of peace by the Allies and the belligerents and since they offer the first chart of internationalism that must some day be realized if world democracy is to become an eventuality.

The Fourteen Points are necessarily suggestive rather than exhaustive. President Wilson has seen fit to enlarge upon but one, the third, and that upon request, the principle of "the removal so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

In reply to the charge that this was an attempt to inflict free trade upon all nations, President Wilson wrote in a personal letter: "I, of course,

meant to suggest no restriction upon the free determination by any nation of its own economic policy, but only that, whatever tariff any nation might deem necessary for its own economic service, be that tariff high or low, it should apply equally to all foreign nations; in other words, that there should be no discriminations against some nations that did not apply to others."

In this question of free seas there is involved the question of free access to the great waterways of the world, the Suez Canal, the Straits of the Dardanelles, the Kiel Canal and the Panama Canal. In the past, these famous arteries of commerce have been open to merchant ships but not to the navies of the world. Under the protection of a League of Nations these waterways would be neutralized, guarded by International agreement and open to all.

It is interesting to note here that we have at least one example of the neutralization of a famous waterway which has been in successful operation for over fifty years — the European Commission of the River Danube. Before the Crimean War, the commerce of the Lower Danube was in constant entanglement and dispute between Austria, Russia, and the surrounding Danubian states. In consequence, river traffic was almost paralyzed. No redress seemed possible, and recrimination waxed bitter until the Crimean War led to an adjustment. Finally, a European Commission of the Danube,

created by the peace treaty and consisting of seven delegates who met and organized in 1856, was formed. This commission saw to the necessary dredging of the lower river, protected ships from piracy, and regulated in time the great system of traffic that constantly flowed through this essential channel of commerce. Other commissions followed up to the time of the last war when a new commissioner was appointed by France to succeed a deceased member.

In a book upon world issues written by a woman to women, it would be lamentable if no program of world peace could be presented formulated from the woman's point of view. In this period of social transition, when women, regardless of sex, are serving upon all planes of social usefulness, a failure to have registered ideals in regard to a program of world peace would have been a failure in that faith, that wisdom that has urged the political liberation of women, since it would imply that in this constructive realm, the protection of humanity, women, long the sentimental guardians of the race, had nothing practical to contribute. Such a failure would not have been compensated for by the oft-repeated praise of woman's work in industry and upon the battle field. For the fingers of women have always been nimble. The courage of women has always been demonstrable. But the brain of woman, thinking however falteringly along international lines, functioning, however imperfectly,

on politically constructive lines, is new and is, we believe, one of the fundamental hopes of world peace in the future.

Fortunately, American women have not been without international vision. In April, 1918, after the President's call to the peoples of the world to form a new world order, the Woman's International League, formerly the Woman's Peace Party of New York, opened a training school and study club for speakers on a democratic League of Nations. Fundamental principles for a League of Nations, organized to prevent war and founded upon President Wilson's Fourteen Points, were worked out and are given at the end of this book, with the permission of the League. The program was prepared by Miss Pauline K. Angell, and is worthy of study and a wider hearing, not only as the first international charter worked out by women, but also because it lays bare the economic and political roots of war. Printed before the election of 1918, these principles were issued as a Congressional Program to be put up to Congressmen who were asked to endorse the following proposals:

"A democratic league of nations, based upon: Free seas; Free markets; Universal disarmament; The right of peoples to determine their own destiny.

"The development of an international parliament and tribunal as the governing bodies of such a league.

"Daylight diplomacy, with democratic control of foreign policy.

"Legislation whereby American delegates to the end-of-the-war conference shall be elected directly by the people.

"Furthermore, that America's championship of the principle of reduced armaments may appeal to the rest of the world as disinterested and sincere, we ask you to oppose legislation committing this country to the adoption of universal military training."

The European programs for a league of nations are many and only a few may be touched upon. In France, in spite of M. Clemenceau's declaration that he had not relinquished the idea of special alliances, the fighting Premier appointed M. Leon Bourgeois, Senator and former Premier of France, to draw up a plan for an association of nations for world peace to co-operate with the Allies. It differs little in the fundamental thought from the American idea.

The framework of a League, in M. Bourgeois' mind, must accomplish three purposes:

"First, it must provide that arbitration be obligatory.

"Second, it must limit armaments.

"Third, it must create penalties for refractory nations." And these penalties would be four in character: diplomatic, judicial, economic and military.

"Most troubles," declared M. Bourgeois, "could be settled by diplomatic and judicial measures alone. And certainly, if economic pressure were brought to bear, the sword need never be drawn in nine cases out of ten."

In England, General Smuts of the British Cabinet, contributed a fine, statesmanlike paper on the functions and machinery of a world league, showing the extent to which it might hope for British backing. Lord Robert Cecil, England's official representative to further the support of a World League, has contributed invaluable work to the cause and, incidentally, has upheld President Wilson's idea that the force of moral opinion must be stronger to prevent war than an organized international police force. "Public opinion would be sufficient to insure at least that any future war would be reduced to single disputes, that is, that there would never be another war like the last war. If we had had a conference on the reply of Serbia to Austria, in 1914, and had not allowed these countries to fight for a set period, there would have been no war. *If the situation had been known to the world no nation could have forced its people to fight.*" (The italics are mine.)

For the most comprehensive program with practical technicalties for a World Court and the most completely formulated program of international organization, we must also turn to England. It is to be found in the report of the Research Depart-

ment of the Fabian Society of London, the draft being made by Mr. L. S. Woolf, with an introduction by Bernard Shaw, published under the title of "International Government."

It will be noted by the student of these articles by Mr. Woolf that they do not propose to prevent war by forbidding sovereign states the right to declare war. War can no more be prohibited than murder may be prohibited. It may only be delayed, made punishable and increasingly disadvantageous. On the other hand, war delayed by arbitration has been found to be almost invariably war indefinitely deferred. In the last one hundred years over two hundred cases have been arbitrated, not one of which has led to war. This was the strength of Mr. Bryan's famous "Thirty Treaties." The signatories promised to wait for one year before declaring war, the disputed question being taken over by arbitration — the rule of "when angry, count one hundred" being applied to nations as to individuals.

It will be seen also that this Fabian program answers some of the questions that have troubled American Senators. Would Bulgaria have the right to dictate to the United States? Would America be willing to have trouble with Mexico submitted to a World Court? Would Montenegro vote equally with Great Britain? The Council sitting for America would pass upon American questions; the Council sitting for Europe would pass upon European decisions; and the Council for

the Balkans would settle Balkan affairs. Only as regarded questions that effect nations as a whole would the Council as a whole be called upon.

This program is especially worthy of study since any ultimate covenant for world federation must eventually follow in principle some such practical outline.

Chapter VII.

OUTLINES OF THE PARIS COVENANT.

THE Amended Covenant of the Paris League embodies the following main points in its outlines. The League is to have a body of delegates, called an Assembly, an Executive Council and a Secretariat.

The Assembly meets at stated intervals at the capital of the League (Geneva) or wherever called. Each State has one vote but may send three representatives. The first meeting is to be called by the President of the United States.

States not in the League may be admitted by a vote of two-thirds of the States represented in the Body of Delegates, but must be self-governing and must give guarantees of observance of international obligations and conformity to the rules concerning armaments. Any member of the League may, after two years notice of its intentions so to do, withdraw from the League.

The Executive Council consists of representatives of five Great Powers and four others, the delegates selecting the four States whose representatives sit with the Great Powers in the Executive Council.

Amendments to the Covenant require a three-fourths vote of the States represented in the Assembly, after the unanimous approval by States represented in the Council.

The Assembly may act in disputes with the same powers as the Council, if the Council requests it, or if either party requests it within fourteen days after submitting the dispute to the Council.

The Executive Council deals with any matter "affecting the peace of the world." It must meet at least once a year at the capital of the League or wherever ordered, the first meeting being called by the President of the United States.

The duties of the Executive Council are to elect a Secretary General, make plans for reduction of armament, recommend scale of military equipment to the States and advise how to secure protection of territorial integrity and independence of members against external aggression. (Art. X).

The Executive Council acts as a Council of Conciliation in disputes not referred to arbitration, and must give out recommendations within six months; directs publication of statements by all parties in a dispute and also of its own recommendations; if its recommendation is unanimous, considers how to enforce it if necessary; if not unanimous, the majority and minority reports shall be published. The Council also considers how to enforce the award of arbitration if necessary.

The Executive Council is to establish a perma-

nent Court of International Justice; it is to recommend and conduct coercion of States not keeping the pledge to use arbitration or conciliation or disregarding awards. This coercion is to take the form of the economic boycott, cessation of all intercourse and the blockade. These failing, the military and naval forces of League members are to be employed against the recalcitrant nation.

The Executive Council may compel States outside the League to submit their disputes to the Covenant regulations to prevent war. Also it defines by charter the authority to be exercised by mandatory States.

The duties of the Secretary General are to arrange for full investigation and consideration of all disputes received by the League. He is to publish promptly all the treaties of the League, no treaty being valid until it is so reported. The Permanent Secretariat, headed by the Secretary General, is to be remunerated by the League on the basis used in the Postal Union.

The Covenant creates commissions appointed by the delegates or Council. These commissions are (1) Military and Naval Commissions to advise on armament and traffic in munitions; (2) Mandatary Commissions; (3) Permanent International Bureau of Labor established to secure fair and humane conditions of labor.

The mandates are for colonies and territories left unprotected as a result of the war. (1) Pro-

visionally Independent States in the old Turkish Empire may be helped by a Power whom they may aid in choosing; (2) For Central African Territories (the German Colonies), administration is given entirely to a mandatary; equal economic opportunity and freedom of religion must be granted; there must be no trade in slaves, arms, or liquor, and no military establishment or training except for police and defense; (3) Southwest Africa and Southern Pacific Island are to be administered as integral parts of mandatory States. The mandataries must render annual reports to the League.

For the direct prevention of war, the members of the League agree to acquaint each other with their military and naval programs and conditions of their munition industries; to defend each other's territorial integrity and independence against external aggression, and to regard any threat of war as business for the League, either the Assembly or the Executive Council.

Disputes not to be adjusted by diplomacy are to be settled by arbitration, by Commissions of Inquiry and by the Permanent Court.

The States are to make no war in any case until three months after the awards or recommendations are announced. They are to submit to the Secretary General, promptly, full statements of each side in a dispute, which statements the Council may publish forthwith; to join in resisting a Covenant-breaking State, and to let League forces cross their

territories; and they are to give the League control of trade in arms and ammunition in countries where control is need.

The much discussed Article X is:

"The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such suggestion or in case of any such threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

An amendment of vital interest to women is found in Article VII, Clause 3: "All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women."

Chapter VIII.

THE LEAGUE AND ITS CRITICS.

"The fault, dear Brutus, lies not in our stars
But in ourselves that we are underlings."
— Caesar-Shakespeare.

IN a year of great happenings the embryo of a new relationship between states has been given a constitution, a body. It may not be the constitution many of us had hoped for. It certainly is not the kind of a League we shall have when "the reign of old men is ended," since no statesman, according to Mr. Wells, ever learned anything new after he was forty-five. But at least it opens the way towards a full and complete League of Nations hereafter. As Professor Gilbert Murray has said, "No door has been locked or barred against humanity. In the meantime what is already achieved is a very great thing" since the Covenant is so drawn that it may be shaped into something better. The power of amendment is there and is put up to the men and women of the world. The fact that one amendment, giving women the right to hold office in the League, has already been made, should stimulate the interest and loyalty of women around the globe.

If women find, upon study of the Covenant, that this League is not the League they wish to protect the lives of their sons, then women must take steps to make it such a League, remembering always that there is no substitute for a League of Nations which is immune from risks. Special alliances acknowledge that war is inevitable. A League of Nations alone proclaims that law is the rule and crime (war) the exception. This idea is new among nations as is the idea of trying, in a tribunal, men who began the war, thus making war a legal offense against the public order and placing it in the category of murder and other preventable crimes.

Whatever its shortcomings, the creation of this Covenant represents the most forward step ever taken collectively by a group of nations. For this draft, it must be remembered, is not the work of one man representing the aspirations of one nation. It is the work of many men representing fourteen states and the interests of twelve hundred millions of peoples. The great fact in history is that these nations have been willing to organize their common interests; that the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil, China, Czecho-Slovakia, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Roumania and Serbia have unanimously agreed to pledge themselves that, so far as lies within their power, there shall be no more war. No such common covenant ever before was so widely agreed

upon. No more pregnant covenant to protect the life blood of humanity was ever executed by governments stimulated by the sovereign will of suffering peoples.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the wide-reaching possibilities of this new instrument upon the interests of women. Every clause in every article in some way reaches out and touches the home in every land. In spite of many limitations it is true as President Wilson said when he read the draft: "A living thing has been born, and we must see to it what clothes we put on it." This "we" applies equally to women. It is for men and women the world over to amplify the league where it needs amplification, and clothe it with garments of their own fashioning.

If the women of the earth might be assembled to pronounce judgment upon the draft, from the woman's point of view, I believe that their first criticism of the covenant, and the first garment that they would create for the draft, would be a toga of democracy to be placed on the shoulders of "all of us." With child-like simplicity they would ask, how can there be universal peace so long as "any of us" is left out? And so, I believe that women who honestly wish to guarantee life would move that the new League enlarge itself to take under its protecting wings, not only the victorious nations, but the broken, defeated countries of Europe endeavoring to take form again. Whatever

their mistakes, and their problems are Herculean, these battle-born republics represent the soul of Europe struggling for embodiment. There can be no hope for peace for the sons of women anywhere while these shattered nations, brow-beaten for centuries, are left outside the cordon of world protection. There can be little hope for their new-found freedom unless they themselves receive steadfast and sincere help from sister nations. The alternative is that they will be driven by the law of inevitable necessity into each other's arms. Then we shall have not one league of nations but two defensive alliances. Then we shall be a league of New Europe against a league of Old Europe and humanity must say farewell for years to come to dreams either of stability or world peace.

Surely, peace-loving women the world over must see that a League of Nations, if it is not to be just another more powerful Balance of Power, must be inclusive and not exclusive; that it cannot sentence several hundred millions of peoples to live as outcasts; people who, in obedience to Western will, have succeeded in overthrowing their feudal autocracies and who must not be left to fall into further chaos, but be helped to find a new life, creating their own interpretation of justice if the League of Nations is to be a league of peace and not a league of war.

The argument that the Central Powers are not yet sufficiently stabilized to enter into a world

league is not logical. Only a world league may stabilize and protect them from devouring wolves, within and without — or protect us. Nothing can make nations so ready for democracy as fellowship in a common crusade. All nations wish for peace. All nations are conscious of a common humanity. Ideals of government should not separate while ideals of common human purposes unite. The League of Nations does not dictate to China and Japan their forms of government. It asks only that these countries obey international rules. Why should it determine the government of new states? "The essential test of any state's fitness for the League is that it desires to submit to its conditions." If a country does not obey the common rules, the League has power, both economic and military, to command obedience. If the rules of the League are democratic, the divergent governments within the League, by obeying the rules, in time must become automatically democratic, also.

I believe, too, that women interested above all else in ending war would provide a seamless garment for more democratic representations than is offered in the draft, so that we shall indeed have a league of peoples and not merely a league of conquering governments; that this garment should be made to fit women and labor delegates, and that the rights of small nations should have a stronger guarantee.

To many of us it would seem that the League in its first form is lacking in authority, in that power of international control so necessary to deal with friction between states. If that is true, we shall have the American experience of the Articles of Confederation duplicated: a few years of contention with an inadequate instrument, and then at last a genuine Constitution of a federated world.

But if, from the woman's point of view, the draft of the League of Nations has inherent weaknesses, weakness to be overcome by the insistent voices of an educated public opinion, it as surely has sources of inherent strength. And as women must labor to avert the new instrument's dangers, so must they also labor to strengthen all points tending to preserve universal equilibrium.

Perhaps the most potential possibility for world stability in the draft lies in the creation of a Labor Board, sitting permanently (Article XX), a new and unique organ capable of developing untold strength if it be used and amplified; an organ for protecting those "men, women and children upon whom the great burden of sustaining the work of the world falls. . . . people who go to bed tired and wake up without the stimulation of lively hope." For the first time in history the earth's toilers have an opportunity to touch the helm of government and regulate their destiny and powers —if they will.

Publicity is a second advantage. One of the main duties of the International Secretariat is to publish all documents whatever of interstate interest. In the future, a secret contract between states will be an act of deliberate international duplicity. Honor between states is put upon the same plane as honor between individuals. Secret treaties already existing must be abrogated. "In case of any of the powers signatory hereto or subsequently admitted to the League, shall, before becoming a party to this covenant, have undertaken any obligations which are inconsistent with the terms of this covenant, it shall be the duty of such power to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations." (Last clause, Article XXV.)

The League aims to end aggression. "We are done with annexations of helpless peoples, meant in some instances by some powers to be used merely for exploitation," said President Wilson, commenting upon the draft. This is a paramount aim for women to support for it holds within its grasp the prevention of that imperialism which leads to war. Some day, perhaps, we shall be permitted to read the speech, at the time censored, that President Wilson made at the Peace Table against the bad old system of dividing the spoils of war when the question of the disposal of the German colonies arose. All that seeped through the cable was that he said "America would not be a party to a peace

of loot." The draft affirms that no predatory state, no predatory economic interest, may annex or exploit backward peoples.

The longest article among the twenty-six is Article XIX, dealing with the mandataries of the colonies. Of particular interest is the clause which advocates the "prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory." Eventually these districts with their rich raw materials such as the rubber of Africa should be internationalized and opened fairly to all purchasers. It is, of course, possible that mandatary forms of government also may lend themselves to exploitation. If so, it is another leak in the dyke for women to watch.

The reduction of armaments is fundamentally important to a league that would end war. If wars are to cease there must be not only a reduction of armaments, but also a supervision of the manufacture and distribution of arms. "The Executive Council shall also determine for the consideration and action of the several governments what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament." (Article VIII). Article IX advises: "A permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the League on the

execution of the provisions of Article VIII, and on military and naval questions generally." Again, in Article XVIII, "The high contracting parties agree that the League shall be intrusted with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest" —a real effort to take the "pay out of patriotism" by controlling the explosives of the world.

A permanent Court of International Justice provides machinery for any nation to change, to present its grievances and adjust its rights without recourse to warfare. (Article XIV). If Austria's thin grievance against Serbia had been presented to such a Court in 1914, how many nations besides Germany would have gone to war on the face of the possibility of an open, honest settlement?

Finally, the establishment of the means of an economic boycott is a source of strength of greater efficacy in these days of international economic interdependence, (see Chapter II), than whole armies of birdmen or flotillas of submarines. "Should any of the high contracting parties break or disregard its covenants under Article XII, it shall thereby *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the League, which hereby undertakes immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the

covenant-breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the League or not."

Imagine the plight of a family in the heart of a city, cut off from its butcher, its grocer, its milkman, its iceman, et cetera, and with its postal, telephone and telegraph communications broken, and we can imagine the condition of a segregated recalcitrant nation who wished to disregard the World Court decision, and plunge a fellow nation into war. It is probable that no weapon save the economic weapon, unflinchingly applied, would be necessary to bring a militaristic nation to its knees.

In the appendix I have placed the amended draft of the League of Nations for the constructive criticism of women. No other criticism is worth listening to. It is to be hoped that women will study this draft diligently, remembering the words of M. Leon Bourgeois who said that the commission presented the result of its work "not as something that is final, but only as the result of an honest effort, to be discussed and to be examined not only by this Conference, but also by the public opinion of the world." It is not claimed that this covenant will bring a world millenium, nor even "the almost perfect state" of Hermione. It is claimed, however, that it is the most important

state paper ever enacted; it is claimed that it is the first right step in the right direction of international ethics, and that it touches vitally upon the inherent interests of women. As such, it challenges every conscientious woman's attention, and demands her serious and voluntary support. The Covenant of a League of Nations emerges in what will probably be known as the most chaotic period of history. All human institutions are seen to be in a state of flux, changing, fluid. But no matter what new forms these institutions may assume, some international machinery of co-operation between states will be necessary. In this sense, a League of Nations may be said to be the one permanent political instrument upon the horizon.

In this transitory period, the new draft faces two real dangers: the reactionaries at the top of society, and the extreme revolutionists at the bottom of society. It would be difficult to say which menace is the more acute. In the few remaining pages I want to sketch the line of these dangers, and also suggest where the support of women may be of greatest social value.

The reactionaries, unlike the revolutionists, are not the result of the heaving processes of war. The reactionary we have always with us. His mission is to keep the wheels of progress from turning too fast. He is just a little more timid and backward-looking to-day than usual because he has more reason to be timid and backward-looking.

The ground has been cut away from under his feet. And being blind, or at least suffering from chronic historic astigmatism, he cannot see the new heaven and new earth forming before him.

All of the criticism of the draft, however, is not reactionary. Some of it — a homeopathic portion — is helpful and stimulating. Much of it, both in Europe and America, is neither intelligent or constructive. Though separated by distance and differing in viewpoints on both continents, such criticism springs from identical emotional reactions. Society, as we have said, as a result of four years of dislocation, is in a state of flux and ebb. No one knows which way the tide will turn. In consequence, society everywhere is suffering from the Great Fear.

In Europe there is logical cause for this obsession of fear. Europe has passed through the greatest social cataclysm ever known. It still is moved by convulsions. It seeks, above all else, protection, reinsurance. And so we find even the most powerful countries each voicing its own Great Fear. Will the League of Nations protect freedom of the seas necessary to the British Isles? Will the League guard France, wounded and broken, but still compelled to live, with an exposed frontier, as the nearest neighbor to her historic enemy? Will it guarantee safety to Italy's unprotected Adriatic coast? Will it grant security to Poland, the buffer state between Russian and Austria, and the key to

Eastern Europe? Regarding the new Roumania and the Czecho and Jugo-Slav Republics, trying to learn the alphabet of independence, and to the score or more of infant constellations, shot from the falling meteor of war, the question arises: will the League of Nations give protection to all these national children? Here are real fears that nothing but a general association of states, guaranteeing guardianship, may alleviate. Here are fears that cause wide sympathy and genuine respect.

But in America, who can sympathize with the Great Fear? America has not had her cities torn to their vitals. America has not had her fields drenched with sacred blood. America has not lost treasures that centuries cannot replace. America hardly knows the meaning of suffering. "America had her war and America had a good time!" as one paper blithely commented. America and suffering have not yet merged.

The Great Fear that oppresses the League of Nations in certain localities in America does not spring from suffering, but from the thought of a threatened prosperity. America is a giant, rich beyond dreams of riches. America has a castle almost impregnable. America would retire into this castle and pull up the draw-bridge. Any interloping league of nations that would aspire to climb to its windows must be cut down like Jack-and-the-Bean-Stalk! The Great Fear in America is fear of

responsibility — international responsibility, and financial responsibility. It is fear that our swollen coffers might be depleted by new ties with bankrupt countries, and that to stand as god-mother to new states in Europe implies further sacrifice and danger to self.

Any true American will refuse to believe that this attitude is the attitude of any, but a minority. That this minority is under the spot-light that falls upon the stage of the United States Senate is unfortunate. It gives an American patriot a sudden hot sense of shame.

What will happen if this "doctrine of careful selfishness thought out to the last detail" prevails? What will be the result if the Senate inquiry, "will it not be dangerous to help the world?" should give the lie to America's entrance into the war? Let the President's ringing words answer: "It would be fateful to us not to help it." Let Mr. Frank H. Simonds, the brilliant military expert of the New York Tribune, reply, (Tribune, March 2nd, 1919): "If America should go home now and wash its hands of Europe, refuse to complete its task begun at Chateau Thierry and continued in the Argonne, if America is now to leave Europe mentally and morally as well as physically exhausted by the great struggle, to find its own way out without our help and without the assurance that our presence gives, I think everybody close to the European situation will agree that we may

have Bolshevism from Vladivostock to Land's End." And again, "the fate of Europe depends on American effort and American support. Without America, the League of Nations is a scrap of paper; with America, it may be a symbol and a first great step, not merely towards peace between nations, but towards restoration of economic stability within the separate nations." And this, not from an idealist and transcendentalist, but from a military expert who opposed the President's going to Paris, but was large enough afterwards to admit the necessity and the value of the trip!

I am not going to take up the American objections to the League of Nations — objections that probably will have to be met for years to come even after the League is in operation — because Mr. Taft has done it judicially in his collected speeches. Of that American storm center, the Monroe Doctrine, he has said: "The Monroe Doctrine was announced and adopted to keep European monarchies from overthrowing the independence of and fastening their system upon governments in this hemisphere. . . . the sum and substance of the Monroe Doctrine is that we do not purpose in our own interest to allow European nations or Asiatic nations to acquire, beyond what they now have, through war or purchase or intrigue, territory, political power or strategical opportunity from the countries of this hemisphere."

Article X of the Constitution of the League, an

undertaking to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of every member of the League, is intended to secure this undertaking to all signatory nations, except that it does not forbid purchase of territory or power.

It is interesting to note that much of the opposition, to the League, both in and out of the Senate, springs in a large measure from the same sources that insisted upon America's going into the war — upholders of the great financial interests, men from munition states and the parasitic hangers-on of these interests. Theirs are the voices that condemned the President for not having entered the war earlier, though it is apparent that a united nation would not have followed him earlier when the great West was strongly anti-war. That Mr. Wilson was elected upon the slogan "He kept us out of war" a few months before America's entrance into the war, is proof positive of the predominant American sentiment. Theirs, too, are the voices that now assert that we did not go to war for "idealism" or for "democracy." We went to save our own skins and — the thought is not uttered but it is there — to save our own jeopardized wealth! Always the same motive actuates these people — self-interest. They represent the Junker and Chauvinistic element, unrighteous but powerful, in every state.

The corrective to reaction is liberalism. The reactionaries have performed a real service to

America. The Great Fear has produced a great courage and a great sense of duty and of solidarity in America.

The issue of the League of Nations and the attitude of its selfish opponents have created a strong body of liberal opinion in America such as America never before has known. This body of opinion recognizes that America can no longer live the closeted life. It recognizes that America has come out of the cloister and been drawn into the great currents that are carrying civilization forward and that America must not only move, but must lead.

A conservative is said to be one who worships a dead radical — when he has been dead long enough! A radical is one who wants something until he gets it; then he begins to suspect it. A liberal is one who is free, free from birth and from tradition, who wears no yoke and owes no allegiance, except to humanity; who does not overturn, but remolds; who sees what is good in the old order while he reaches out for what is best in the new.

The greatest service American women may do society to-day is to foster and lead this new body of American liberalism. It is the one hope, not only of checking reaction, but also of directing the forces of revolution that are everywhere threatening the world. Women are not only to end war, but they have it in their power to end civil war —

world revolution. The League of Nations and the social influence and strength of women are both challenged by the manner in which women will face and help solve this most acute of social questions.

Chapter IX.

WOMEN AND REVOLUTION.

"The peoples are in the saddle, and they are going to see to it that if the present governments do not do their will some other government shall." — President Wilson, Boston Speech, February 24th, 1919.

SOCIAL peace is an integral part of world peace, but even an inveterate optimist must fail to find any stable social peace on the world horizon to-day. Instead, there is everywhere strife and travail from which either an inspiring new era or an abortion of civilization will be born.

Since this book was begun, in the fall of 1918, events have moved with a terrifying swirl. The war ended prior to the expectation of military experts. Germany surrendered unconditionally. President Wilson's famous Fourteen Points were accepted as the basis of an Allied Settlement, and the idea of a democratic league of nations as the foundation of a new peace spread over a war-sick world as no idea has spread since Christianity became infused into a pagan universe. All that seemed necessary to insure a machinery of permanent world peace was a strong public opinion in favor of a league founded upon new ideals of world justice.

Then something happened. The joy of the conqueror was short-lived. For, although the Allies had gained a great military victory over Germany, nowhere were the fruits of victory visible. Instead, chaos reigned. Famine and anarchy stalked the land. From war we had stepped to social revolt; from anxiety to terror. We had but exchanged anguishes — and there was no peace in the hearts of men.

What had darkened the horizon? It would seem as if the war, waged and won in the name of democracy, was determined to result in the establishment of democracy. It would seem that the hero of the war — democracy — had assumed leadership, and was taking the road that governments did not intend it should take — the road not of political democracy but of industrial democracy. Democracy was in the saddle, forging ahead and claiming every inch of ground as its own.

In consequence, the League of Nations has had to face, not only the prejudiced opposition that would meet its appearance at any period, but also the most acute social crisis known in history. We call it industrial revolution, and in fact such it is. But it implies something deeper and more organic. Something is happening to the tissue of society — something sensed, but not yet understood. It is not merely that civilization is discarding its old shell, the crust of the ages, to put on a new shell, a

softened replica of the old. It is far deeper than any external change. Something is happening to the bones and sinews of the social organism, from the inside out, from the bottom up. Society is changing its very structure. In consequence, civilization itself is being born again. And this babe of the new era is found, struggling, primarily, in the cradle of new liberties that are emerging from the old autocracies of Europe and trying to form themselves into modern industrial states.

Women must face this fact of social revolution squarely, for it is the heart of the organic world change: that when absolutism was overthrown in the three great Empires of Europe, there was no hesitation as to the ideal the new states should follow. Instinctively, Russia, Germany, Austria moved toward the organization of society upon a more just industrial basis. The old political state meant little to these newly liberated peoples because they had not been a part of it. The significance of the new states, whose future will determine whether the world shall have war or peace, is that the people have determined to establish a direct relationship between the state and the workers and to govern their own destinies from the vantage-point of their economic well-being.

This is the crisis that I believe women must help meet — the crisis of assisting in a structural change in society before there can be any stable world peace. Understanding alone can meet this transi-

tion and make of it a terror or a benefit — first, understanding of the historic side of the industrial revolution —and, second, a sympathy that comes from comprehending its human, social side.

Because of their intense human sympathies, and because of their close relationship to both the contending forces of society, I believe that women to-day have it within their power to become great world stabilizers, standing between the battling forces of humanity, the offensive forces at the bottom of society trying to raise themselves from intolerable living conditions, and the defensive forces at the top, obeying the law of their being and resisting intrenchment upon their power. The passions of each of these classes alone are too strong, too prejudiced, to be a trustworthy guide. Women, not yet become either dominant producers or dominant accumulators of wealth, must stand between these two contending forces and bring peace founded upon social justice to both.

When I say that women must become world stabilizers, I do not mean in the old "blessed-are-the-peacemakers" sense, though that may be included. I mean stabilization by the use of every ounce of the pressure of the new social influence of women on the fevered areas of the world to produce change through legitimate and not illegitimate means.

The duty of a stabilizer is to maintain equilibrium. A stabilizer on an aeroplane, for instance,

is magnetized to all parts of the machine so that when the latter is high in the air and moved by conflicting currents, it restores equilibrium to the whole.

If women are to become social stabilizers as civilization hangs over the abyss of world chaos, they must be alive to all phases of the social question.

It may be that we are still too near the blood-bath of nations to see clearly and estimate the organic social change correctly. But the situation, as far as we can see it, seems to hold in the aftermath of war these three great realizations:

First, that the European political state, as we have known it, has proved inadequate for the great mechanical era in which we live and is being immensely modified;

Second, that in consequence of logical processes of evolution, the industrial state, better fitted to modern industrial needs, is emerging and is summoning us to the reorganization of society upon a more equitable basis.

Third, that as a corollary of economic reconstruction, the state itself is creating a new attitude toward property by laying its hands upon wealth wherever necessary, assuming that wealth, created by all, is a social asset to be administered in the interest of all.

The immediate question before society is not, shall we change? We have gone far beyond voli-

tion. We have changed, we are changing and the people are determined that we shall change much more radically. "The spirit of man is in the saddle," and the flight of the spirit may not be stayed. The acute problem before society is how to change the organic structure of society peacefully with as little dislocation as possible to its component, interdependent parts.

The problem, therefore, for women to grasp is how to check anarchy without checking needed social evolution; how to stay violence, at either extremity of the social scale, without stopping any of the liberating processes of reconstruction.

It is well for women to remember that the irresponsible political state is not changing because the Allies defeated Germany. The war accelerated but did not originate industrial unrest. Nor is it being modified because Karl Marx wrote *Das Kapital* or Henry D. Lloyd wrote *The Co-operative Commonwealth.* Rather is it passing because James Watt watched the steam lift the lid from a tea-kettle, and because Edmund Cartwright invented the power loom.

The irresponsible political state is changing because it did not meet the needs of an industrial civilization. It did not satisfy its logical demands. In an age of the greatest productivity, it did not grant that security, that glow of life and health and plenty that it should have assured even to the least of its subjects. It failed humanity because,

in an industrial era, it administered life still from a political viewpoint — the preservation of political parties for purposes of partisanship, power and political preferment — rather than from the viewpoint of the changing economic necessities of the average man.

And because political interest has long been secondary in the mind of the average man, absorbed in wrestling a livelihood from society, politics have been left largely to politicians. "The most incisive comment on politics to-day is indifference," wrote Walter Lippmann in *A Preface to Politics* — a brilliant effort to put the subject of politics in a different light so that it might "rivet our creative interests." Politics for the most part, has failed to touch our creative interests; and so we have seen not only a growing popular indifference to the issues of opposing parties, but also a weakening of the distinguishing principles of these parties. Once a broad line of cleavage marked the line between Republican and Democratic theory — the principles of Tory or Whig, of loyalists or federalists. To-day, the demarkation is so slight that, in the last Presidential campaign, a witty reporter crudely remarked that the difference between Mr. Hughes and President Wilson might be removed by a competent barber in ten minutes! Both parties, it is said, have come innately anchored to one principle — the protection of "big business." And so, lacking real issues, we have seen our great

elections degenerating into campaigns of personality, campaigns of intensive bitterness, the man with his virtues or shortcomings being substituted for principles.

But if the average man, too absorbed in keeping his head above the swift-running commercial tide, did not comprehend that the new industrial era demanded new economic forms of administration, our great business geniuses saw the change and acted upon it. The passing of the irresponsible political state, as such, was evidenced when the great financial interests flooded the lobbies and took control of government. The name of Theodore Roosevelt will be known in history as the name of the man who recognized this change and did what he could to uncover the questionable methods of organized finance. For years, even in democracies, the "invisible government" has ruled, not always corruptly, perhaps, but always selfishly. As kings exploited their subjects for territorial aggression, so the "interests" exploited the citizens of the political state for economic aggression, building around the world an interlocking network of finance. The state was their tool, never their master. They bent it and the candidates, wittingly and unwittingly, whom they chose to represent them, as an archer bends a bow to his will.

And so the modern state became immensely hypocritical. Germany prated of loyalty to the Fatherland. What its militarism rested upon was

loyalty to the great merchant princes who had built up the amazing industrial strength of Germany and who were bent upon the economic subjugation of the world.

No woman can trace the deeply intertwining roots of this war who does not study the economic ambitions of Germany. And in no book is the character of the modern commercial state — masquerading in the guise of monarchy — laid so shamelessly bare as in Frederick Naumann's *Mittel-Europa.* Here, in masterly fashion, we find the economic state glorified — naked, hungry, primeval and unashamed. Here we find the great World Powers without subterfuge in their economic settling, functioning in fierce world centers — London — Petrograd — New York. Eventually, Herr Naumann tells us, "great economic groups will supersede these World Powers" and rule the world openly as they now rule it covertly — England, Russia, the United States and Germany (because Germany, even with the help of Austria-Hungary, he asserts, could not hope to be any but a fourth world power). *'Groups of humanity* will come into being, because such new technical apparatus as steam power and electricity cannot work *with State formations still under the influence of earlier and now vanished forms of international intercourse."* (The italics are mine.)

"The foundation of the German Empire is a classical example of the politico-economic process

of enlargement. This development is independent of all our individual wills. Even those who regard it with horror in its relation to personal and national culture are forced to regard it as fact."

But Germany is not the only state that has been forced by the times into this modern mould of the "politico-economic process of enlargement." "The plans of the modern world are made in the counting house," President Wilson told the throngs whom he addressed in Turin. "The men that do the business of the world now shape the destinies of the world and peace or war is now in a large measure in the hands of those who conduct the commerce of the world."

"Bunty pulls the strings" — and the nations dance, to whatever tune the "interests" want piped. And the shame lies, not in having financial interests rule. In a commercial age they must rule. The shame lies in the deception practised, the subterfuge used, the power appropriated and concentrated instead of widely diffused. The shame lies in the result — in the control of avenues forming public opinion; in the swaying of peoples by the subtle appeal to the imagination — to patriotism, to country and to flag — all sacred symbols that should be above the possibility of economic prostitution. The shame lies in the application of principles of idealism to aims that are not primarily ideal or pure.

The commercial age is not, however, to be flouted

because of its shams and artifices, its misapplication of principles. It is a glorious age full of creative achievement. It is only its exclusive appropriations that are unworthy. It is only its selfishness that is sordid. When we recognize its true possibilities — that it holds within its horn of plenty the material salvation of mankind; when we have adjusted ourselves to making it the servant and not the exploiter of humanity, we shall see it as the true Golden Age. And the release of creative energy — held down now by gnawing want in the sight of a table groaning with abundance for all — will be felt not in one, but in all lands. The industrial revolution will liberate the genius of the race.

To call this social revolution a bastard, the child of anarchy, is to acknowledge one's historic ignorance. The industrial revolt is as legitimate a product of the mechanical era of civilization in which we live as the French Revolution was politically the result of the nationalistic spirit that, in the XVIIIth Century, swept Europe.

The economic revolution is here because it was historically due. Man won his religious freedom when Martin Luther nailed his Bulls on the Cathedral doors and defied Rome. Man won political freedom when the French Revolution asserted the Rights of Man over the rights of kings. He has not yet won industrial freedom. In the feudal days the workers were enslaved by

the baronial system. In modern days the workers are enslaved by the machine. Man cannot be free until the machine to which he is chained most of his waking hours becomes his friend, not his enemy. He cannot be free until he pries himself from the iron strangle-hold of the machine. That is the meaning of strikes and lockouts. It is more than a question of bread and meat. The spirit of man must be industrially free.

The industrial state is emerging because men everywhere are revolting against the machine-like character of their existence. For multitudes, life has become too difficult for its continuance. For multitudes, life has become not a joy but a despairing grind.

When you confine a man to a machine ten hours he doesn't have much time to care about who runs the state. He cares most about who makes the laws that govern his industrial well-being. And it is not surprising if in time he decides to control his own industrial fate, as in a country of free institutions he may.

This, then, is the acute social situation in brief outline. The industrial enterprises of men have become more vital to them than their political enterprises and must be given first place in the machinery of life.

Europe is offering two methods of attaining this reorganization of society. The first is the so-called Bolshevist method — an open dictatorship of

the proletariat, overturning of the Bourgeois, expropriation of land and wealth, meeting opposition with physical force where resistance is offered. It is a logical reaction against the violence of the Romanoffs. It is a sweet revenge against a corrupt bureaucracy and the prison-house of Siberia. But it should stop at the borders of Russia where apparently it must surge until the bitterness of the ages has been washed away.

The strength of the Bolshevist movement lies in its appeal to suffering humanity, and in its challenge to direct action. The weakness of Bolshevism is that it substitutes one form of dictatorship for another. It accomplishes just what it aims to overthrow — class rule. It is not democratic. It is autocratic. There is no more democracy in a proletarian dictatorship than there has been in a capitalistic dictatorship. The shoe is but changed to the other foot.

The danger that lurks in Bolshevism is not found in the fact that it believes in the control of industry by the workers. Its danger is not even that it attacks the sacred fetish of property and would prevent the swollen fortunes of yesterday. The menace of Bolshevism is that it would poison the springs of life by embittering class against class, as Colonel Raymond Robins testified before the Overman Committee in Washington. If artificial barriers have been erected between peoples, they must come down. They must not be entrenched

by further hatred since the interests of humanity are primarily one. War proved this and peace must underwrite it. Whatever is of real human value in the Soviet Council — the rule of men elected by trades rather than geographical districts — and is genuinely constructive will live and will be incorporated in the new industrial state. But the Bolshevist philosophy of class antagonism and a new world built upon the enmity of man to man will not live because it is not fundamentally true. Bolshevism founded upon class hatred may plunge the world into bloodshed, but it cannot be the foundation of the new world state.

The second method that Europe offers for hastening the day of industrial justice is found in the program of the British Labor Party — a program that would change society through the ballot, legislating until industry becomes democratically controlled (see Chapter V) — and is the peaceful method for which women should stand.

In England the impetus toward social change springs largely from the workers who are strongly organized in industrial trade unionism and who know definitely what they desire.

In America where only 10 per cent. of the workers are organized, the impetus to change should spring from the top of society, from Captains of Industry themselves, so many of whom have come from the ranks, and from women with a sympathetic understanding of the social question.

In this chapter we are not primarily concerned with what our business genius is doing to cope with social revolution. It knows that America is no more safe from the contagion of European anarchy than she was safe from the contagion of European war. The waves of calamity travel fast and submerge suddenly when they do appear. The American employer wants industrial peace, and in many cases is working to establish peace with justice. In these pages we are concerned primarily with the attitude of those ranking officers of our Captains of Industry — their indulged women-folk.

There is but one person in the world who has more power than a capitalist and that is the wife of the capitalist. She not only commands almost unlimited resources, but in many cases she commands even the capitalist himself!

In America women are not the power behind the throne. They are the throne. The American woman, lapped in luxury, is the modern sovereign queen. It is hardly too much to say that the fate of millions of workers the world over may lie in the American woman's attitude toward this crucial hour. If these sheltered women are blind and selfish, the men will be blind and selfish. If women of wealth are narrow, the men will be narrow. If they are limited in vision, unyielding and stony-hearted to the demands of a new era, the men will be limited, unyielding and stony-hearted to the

insistent voices of to-day. And they will invite their own and the world's doom.

Two things frankly operate against the American woman's leadership in the world crisis: first, indifference to the social question, and, second, ignorance of the facts of life.

The factor of indifference may be dismissed. Few women exist who could be indifferent to the welfare of children — if they knew that the labor problem was primarily a problem of improved children and improved homes. The trouble is that they do not know it! Which leads to the second factor, real and appalling — the amazing ignorance of educated women to a knowledge of how the other four-fifths live — the absence of even a bowing acquaintance with modern economics or sociology.

A woman may speak in French and sing in Italian and yet not be able to converse in the a, b, c's of social science! If you speak to her of the labor question, she will reply with complaints of her cook or her chauffeur! Organized labor means to many women organized affrontery. It does not mean the one method, full of evils as the organization of capital is full of evils, of raising the standard of life for all.

Or if they do realize that industrial adjustment is the crying need of the hour, they think of industrial injustice as something nebulous and distant, like the shameful child labor just reported by Miss

Julia Lathrop of the Child Welfare Board in Washington, in ten industries of the South. They do not know that here in streets just off New York's main artery, women bend over machines, in the rush to produce ready-made garments, from morning to night, hardly stopping for luncheon, doing piece work for five cents a dozen seams! They do not know that here in New York City every twelfth person is buried in Potter's Field; that 20,000 children were wards of the city last year because their parents were unable to care for them, and that one child in every five is not properly nourished because its parents are under-paid.

Not all women, among the wealthy, however, are socially ignorant. Perhaps never was there so much individual and concerted welfare work done by women as is done to-day. But the present crisis does not call for welfare work any more than it calls for philanthropy. It calls for recognition that civilization has reached the turning-point in history and must alter its fundamental framework or be overthrown.

In England women have a wider recognition of the economic crisis and a greater willingness to co-operate with it. That super-woman, Mrs. Pankhurst, and her brilliant daughters, have clearly defined plans for dealing with the social question. But their methods are individualistic methods. They are not methods broad enough to deal with a situation so widely and abysmally collective.

"It is not the bourgeoisie that is to be abolished, but the proletariat," declares Miss Christabel Pankhurst in her pamphlet, *Industrial Salvation.* "The community is to be leveled up, not leveled down." With all of which we agree. But how are these miracles to be accomplished? By increasing the production of wealth, by establishing a basic wage, plus a "proportionate share of a collective bonus on total output."

The workers of Europe, worn with four years of war, are very tired. Many of them, in spite of higher wages, are under-nourished. We can't see hope of industrial stability through increased production when the crying need is for increased distribution. Reconstruction must take more basically scientific lines.

"If reconstruction is a race with revolution, remember a race cannot be won by running the opposite way," a British Captain of Industry recently advised in America. Women who would deal with revolution must deal with it by going to meet it — not by running in the opposite direction.

The remedy lies not only in sympathy and understanding, but in co-operation, a co-operation that will remove the *causes of revolution.* American women must agitate for a League of Nations that will meet the underlying causes of revolution fairly and squarely. The Bolshevist plan of direct social action must be disarmed by being met by immediate social legislation on the part of a League of Nations

which seems to have been providentially created for this vast purpose. No other instrument may act quickly enough or over a wide enough area. Bolshevism must be met, not by suppression, which simply forces the virus into other channels. Bolshevism is a sympton — like the I. W. W. — a symptom of something festering at the social core. Bolshevism must be met by cutting out the causes of Bolshevism. These causes are broken promises on the part of governments toward peoples; unemployment; scarcity of food and its outrageously high cost; and finally, the difficulty of getting raw materials, which is doing more to keep Europe from getting back to a normal basis of productivity, and is thus feeding the flames of revolution, than any other cause. Sporadic efforts are being made in many cases, to cope with these causes of revolution, but nothing has yet been done widely enough to meet so wide spreading a danger.

In America, how may women save their land from the disastrous effects of revolution? They have the privilege of using their citizenship as they have never used it before. The first step in good citizenship is interest, the second is knowledge, the third is consecration to the cause.

The first step in promoting social peace is to see that we elect to office only men who stand for a new social order, and if such men are not forthcoming, to put liberated women into the breach. The experience of Paris demonstrates that men

trained in the old order cannot create principles of statesmanship adequate for a new day.

American women as well as American men must shake off their sluggishness toward their civic responsibilities and stop criticising a government which it is their duty and privilege to adjust. There is nothing the matter with the American government except that the units of the democracy do not use it. They leave it to politicians to use for them — and then complain that it is undemocratic!

The political institutions of America are not adamant. They are yielding and malleable as experiments now going on within our borders prove. If this fact is realized, it is possible to achieve the necessary economic reorganization of society peacefully in America without overturning those institutions that originated, as we saw, in the spirit of liberty and democracy for all.

American women may take time by the forelock and move to institute change before trouble arrives at the door. A minimum wage is another practical step. This wage has been fixed by the War Labor Board at $15 a week for a woman and $30 a week for a man with a family of five. This minimum budget of $1500 according to Professor William F. Osborn, a social expert, allows $76 a year for the man's clothes and $55 a year for the woman's. A tailored gown, he suggests, every fourth year!

The most fundamental move toward social peace

undoubtedly is to institute a general partnership between the employer and the employee. Since it is the machine that deadens the worker and robs his life of spontaneity and joy, we must alter the worker's relationship to it. He must own the machine in part and not be owned by it. When a man has a concrete interest in his tools, we shall not have to urge "speeding up" the output. The output will be his pride, just as the machine will be his pride, for it will be the symbol of his elevation and not the symbol of his servitude.

But the most telling work of the American women in avoiding revolution will be the ethical attitude she adopts toward revolution. Ever since the horror of war stunned and dazed us almost into inability to follow any spiritual implication, men have nevertheless reached out for the spiritual intent. A "spiritual rebirth," we have been told, was sweeping the world. But where were its results? Where did it function? Many of us have looked for its manifestations in vain.

The ethical results of the war, nevertheless, are beating through the world to-day, working through the forces of social evolution, trying to crystallize the new spiritual impetus in many minds, trying to force humanity as a whole into a finer, higher mould. Women must co-operate with these ethical forces and try to garner them into a new social sheaf. Women must not fear revolution. They must comprehend it and direct it.

"Who fears the throe that rebellion brings
Hath bartered God for the will of kings,"

as Angela Morgan, America's great poet of democracy, sings. By comprehending the social trend of revolution, it is possible for American women to stand against violence, everywhere, but like America's great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, stand also for "honest rebellion" wherever injustice reigns.

Finally, revolution is the friend and not the foe of women, since it will eventually contribute to the woman's innate desire to conserve life. Industrial revolution is based upon organic social change, and the foundation of this change will be a new attitude toward wealth, and, correspondingly, a new attitude toward life. When we have a society that realizes that wealth is socially created and to be socially applied; that it is to be put under our feet as a means of elevating the whole social structure and not used as a means of submerging it, we shall have a new emphasis upon life and a new emphasis upon property. We shall have a civilization built, not upon the sacred principle of the conservation of property, but upon the sacred principle of the conservation of life — and all war will become punishable, preventable crime.

Europe, in war time, was called upon to make greater sacrifices than America, whose potential strength was barely touched. But America, in

peace, has an opportunity to lead in the imperative sacrifices of peace. And these sacrifices should be initiated by American women to whom "everything" has been given. Mr. John Galsworthy has told us recently what those sacrifices must be.

"If I were to put our civilization in one word," he said, "I should call it feverish, and I think that some sort of revolution in our standards of taste and demands would be far more important to us than any revolution of a political nature. To bring about this need, we must simplify ourselves." Then he adds naïvely: "I see no signs of it."

Is there no hope that America will read the handwriting on the wall? Will America refuse to take a leaf from history? Is there no hope that American women, at the top of the social scale, will refuse to "simplify" themselves in order that misery at the bottom may vanish? Yes, there is hope, for America and for the world, and it lies largely, I believe, in the hands of America's young womanhood, the girls from luxurious homes who entered so whole-heartedly into war service and found a happiness in sacrificial service never found before.

What "our boys" did for human liberty at Chateau Thierry "our girls" will do for human liberties in time of peace. They will stand for Americanism — true Americanism. We do not even have to quote "idealism" when we speak of true Americanism. We have only to recall the facts of America's origin.

True Americanism is against all injustice and class distinction. True Americanism is against proletarian, bourgeois, or capitalistic exclusive rule. True Americanism will not meet Bolshevism with foolish prohibitions and the restriction of civil liberties that only promote further ferment. True Americanism will meet Bolshevism with the only principle that may disarm it: Thy land is my land, thy people are my people, thy God is my God. True Americanism stands for the spirit of liberty, everywhere, liberty restricted in the interest of all.

A few years ago an American girl performed an act of singular and prophetic beauty. When the Goddess of Liberty in New York Harbor was lighted by electricity, as the statue burst into light, Ruth Law, fresh from a record-breaking flight from Chicago, circled above the statue and wrote "Liberty" in flaming letters upon the sky.

To-day the act has a peculiar symbolism. In the hour of the world's darkness, it is for American women to arise and inscribe "Liberty" — righteous and universal industrial liberty — in flaming letters upon the dome of the world.

Chapter X.

THE WOMAN'S PART IN A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time; and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment." — Judges 4: 4-5.

AS I write, the symbol of a League of Nations is rising in Europe. It offers a Court for all humanity, a temple where the world's common interests may be guarded, and where life itself may be sanctified by the substitution of law for war — if the people will.

What may women do to strengthen its foundation and make real this dream of every true woman, the realization of a world with an alternative to war?

The foregoing chapters on world federation have been written because I believe that the response of women to the support of a world league will be half-hearted unless the league presents itself to women as something vital and personal to their interests. If the League of Nations is to be considered merely as a political organization, it will not gain the widespread support of women, since women, in the aggregate, are not yet generally moved by things political. If it be merely an

economic association to regulate the commercial interests of the Great Powers, it will kindle little enthusiasm in the hearts of women, since women are not yet closely related to economic initiative. But if it may be shown to be a human instrument created primarily to safeguard every woman's son, it is posssible that the maternal passion for guarding life may be ignited around the world, and that women may become its chief bulwarks. Now that a better way than war to settle world difficulties is offered, it is inconceivable that women in large numbers will not arise in every land to mould and direct it. In any case, I believe that a league of free nations will fail without women's individual and collective support.

And so, in the foregoing chapters, I have tried to present the need of a democratic League of Nations to women as fundamentally a great human need, touching very closely the lives of women. I have tried to show that, in reality, a world league, since it aims to safeguard life, means more to women than to men, since women through motherhood stand more closely related to the humanities, being under compulsion not only to create life but to preserve it.

Briefly, I have sketched the human necessity for international agreement: our chaotic foreign relationship, leaving the individual sovereign state lawless, anarchistic, armed, and with a freedom permitted to no individual; the need to create some

form of international machinery whereby nations may change without resort to war and the establishment of some supernational authority in order that political organization may keep pace with economic organization, which has long been international.

In a glimpse into the past to get the background of the League, we saw the historic parting of the ways with the old Balance of Power expiring in the ashes of Empire and a new Europe, phoenix-like, arising. We saw the rival crafts of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, created to safeguard society, in reality foundering through the weight of the barnacles they inevitably attracted: economic rivalries, imperialistic ambitions, and competitive armaments. We saw, under this rivalry, Europe, in ten years of this new century, torn with five wars; we saw the Balkan States and Turkey, tools of Russia and Austria, constantly embroiled by these countries against each other. We saw Germany, aiming at Eastern dominion, maintaining Turkey, reaching out a long iron arm to Bagdad, and seizing the moment when the Serajevo shot was fired because in an Austrian quarrel she could count on the support of her unstable ally and also because the moment had come to reduce Serbia — successful in the Balkan War of 1912 — and prevent the foundation of a strong Serbian State which would impede Germany's progress to the southeast.

In America and the New Order we saw the Thirteen American Colonies fighting for self-determination and offering an example of state federation that must serve as a model for eventual world federation. The gift of America to the world, we found, was the gift of the American spirit — the spirit of justice, of fair play and a square deal for all. American isolation, we found, had become a thing of the past, since the countries of the world had become neighbors; the Monroe Doctrine was not to be discarded but applied to all nations, and American idealism was to magnetize and democratize the earth.

The fundamentals of world federation, we saw, were, and must remain, free peoples, free markets, free seas, open covenants and reduction of armaments. The woman's program, discussing President Wilson's Fourteen Points, was cited, not only because it is the first discussion by a body of American women of fundamentally international principles, but also because it discusses the causes of war and goes to the root of the prevention of war by removing the offshoots of financial imperialism — foreign investments, foreign exploitation of backward peoples, and the reprehensible habit of the flag following trade — thus plunging whole nations into war to protect private enterprise.

But political democracy, we found, would insure but one-half of the Tribunal of world justice. The other half must rest upon the solid ground of

industrial democracy. The invention of machinery had precipitated a new commercial era of enormous productivity to which the war found society still unadjusted. Great wealth and abysmal poverty challenged men side by side. Universal strikes and dangerous social cleavages warned that, having solved the problem of production, we must now turn our attention toward solving the problem of a more equitable distribution. We glimpsed the rise of labor as an inevitable factor in this new industrial order and saw that there could be no real peace until autocracy in industry had been banished as the world war had overthrown autocracy in the State. In the program of the British Labor Party we cited an orderly plan of the workers themselves for the democratic control of industry, and for those great social changes which the war has necessitated, by peaceful, not by violent methods.

This, briefly, is a resumé of the outline of a democratic League of Nations to end war which women are asked to help inaugurate and support. What may women do, practically, to sustain this first-born child of the nations, in order that it may not die of negligence or be throttled in the inevitable reactions of peace?

The final arbiter of every cause is Public Opinion. In order to capture Public Opinion, a great philosopher once said that every cause must pass through three stages: agitation, education and

organization. The League of Nations has practically reversed this order and begun with organization. While the men in Paris worked, the peoples of the world wondered. Except in academic circles, there had been little discussion and little understanding of the principles of world federation. A very real service may be contributed by women toward the support of a League of Nations in the immediate creation of a strong educated Public Opinion.

Once, the idea of women as important factors in forming public opinion would have been ludicrous. To-day, every vehicle of publicity, the press, the forum, the pulpit, the stage, is open to women as well as to men. Moreover, their channels of agitation, through bodies of organized women, are deep and endless.

It would be difficult to find a woman to-day not enrolled in some kind of an organization, religious or social. Think what a phalanx of educators would be created if all women in every organization in every land — not merely leaders but average home women—would convince themselves that the new instrument of peace was their league instituted for them and dependent upon them for its life — and would each make of herself a committee of one to uphold it. What a loyal legion of world solidarity would arise! What a sisterhood of women would at last be created!

For years, believers in the unutilized, collective

power of women have been hoping for some great unifying principle that would inspire and unite all women, some great question of universal social responsibility. And here at last it is! The woman's charge of the sacred principle of life and, for the first time in history, a practical instrument whereby she may discharge that obligation! A universal crusade to end war! Not a woman's crusade alone. Not that tedious segregation of sex which sets women apart from the vital currents of life. But co-operation with men, men and women working together, side by side for a common cause, the greatest of all common causes — the safeguarding of human life through the organization of common purposes.

Think what a public sentiment would be formed if not only every individual woman but every group of women committed itself to the intelligent support of a league of free nations. Every church in every town, large or small, would become vibrant. Every woman in every sewing society or Kings' Daughters would have a royal mission and find her voice in the universal anthem.

Think what a body of support for this new thing under the sun would be formed if women's clubs and the D. A. R. Chapters took up the study of a league of nations — limitless and unending — and educated the great body of alert clubwomen to an intelligent appreciation of a league's functions and activities.

Follow out the possibilities of this educational campaign through the arteries of the great suffrage associations and women's trade unions. Classes to consider the various phases of a world league, political, economic and social, offer channels of study for years to come. For a league is not to be a hard and fast instrument, unyielding and unchanging — "not a straight-jacket but a vehicle of life." It is, therefore, to be modified and changed as the times change and demand modification, just as the Constitution of the United States has been amended and is subject to varying interpretation by the Supreme Court. It must become what the units of world democracy (women as well as men) demand that it shall become to safeguard their interests and homes.

And teachers! Think of the opportunity of that large body of women educators, entrusted with the plastic mind of the young! "The future of the League of Nations depends in the long run on its appeal to the imagination of the growing child." Think of the possibilities in teaching children the oneness of life! Think of the privilege of training children to regard the world as a whole, each nation, each man a friend as the childish instinct always takes for granted until life with its false valuations intervenes and tells him to beware!

"All human institutions are made up of propaganda," writes H. G. Wells in *A League of Free Nations,* "are sustained by propaganda and perish

when it ceases; they must be continually explained and re-explained to the young and the negligent. And for this new world of democracy and the League of Free Nations. . . . there must be the greatest of all propaganda. For that cause every one must become a teacher and a missionary. 'Persuade to it and make the idea of it and the necessity for it plain,' that is the duty of every school teacher, every tutor, every religious teacher, every writer, every lecturer, every trusted friend throughout the world. For it, too, every one must become a student, must go on with the task of making vague intentions into definite intentions, of analyzing and destroying obstacles, of mastering the ten thousand difficulties of detail."

What does this sudden swift need of educational propaganda in the form of a common covenant of power, following the most disastrous of world wars, a war in which women distinguished themselves in every branch of public service, in reality call for? Does it not summon women to become propagandists for peace in greater numbers even than responded to the call of war?

It is true that the summons to peace is not so dramatic as the summons to war. It may be said, therefore, that the call of women to peace may fail through lack of the picturesque element of war. It is true that, in the past, peace has not held the spectacular lure that war has undoubtedly furnished. It is true that women did enjoy the becom-

ing uniform, did enjoy the well-earned rank, thrilled to the bugle blast and the march to victory just as men thrilled because both had suffered from the starved imagination and colorless, unsacrificial life of modern times.

But the idea of maintaining a league of free nations, I hold, will stimulate the imagination of men and women and transform the dull gray of the old-time negative peace to one that will vibrate with color and variety. The very success of the league idea pre-supposes that the "drab of peace" must vanish and the "gayety of nations," so long an empty phrase, be substituted. And it is for women, I belive to catch and hold this new rainbow note that circled over the world war and, by emphasizing it in peace, bring world unity picturesquely before the nations. In other words, women may *dramatize peace* and make it as colorful and vital — yes, it might as well be said — as *interesting* as war.

And how is peace to be dramatized? How did war become dramatic in New York City? After the public mind was once kindled, Fifth Avenue went into gala costume. It hung itself with festoons and streamers. The barren sidewalks blossomed with evergreens. The heavens were a blue background for banners. The shop windows became giant picture frames. Fashion faded and humanity mingled. Castes melted and selfishness vanished. Never had we dreamed that our beautiful thorough-

fare could be so nobly, democratically, seriously gay!

And how was this varied beauty stimulated? By the appeal to idealism! By the appearance of other flags besides our own, by the spirit of sacrifice — the most "happyfying" of all emotions — for other countries beside our own, by the spirit of working for other peoples besides our own. In short, by the something new and gladdening born out of the gauntness of war — the dramatic portrayal of the new fact in history: that the things that unite us are stronger than the things that separate us, since the interests of all nations are in reality one.

Peace, also, must have its international fêtes and holidays. The Avenue of the Allies must not become a mere memory. It must bloom and blossom periodically to remind us of the beauty of sacrifice and assure us that that for which we fought has been forever won. Peace will be picturesque if we keep our annual League of Free Nations Day, our French, our British, our Italian days, but not otherwise. Do we not owe these colorful festivals to the cosmopolitan character of our great city?

And here may I turn aside a moment to warn women not to lose themselves in the maze of discussion about nationalism and internationalism? Self-determination means the establishment of nationality, or it means nothing. It means that language and religion and racial culture and cus-

toms are to be respected and are not to be crushed by some superior imperialistic power as Russia crushed the Jews and as Austria crushed her subject races.

At the same time there is no hope for the security of nationalism, for economic life and political perpetuity, except under the banner of internationalism. "Each for all" must be the new motto, and not "Each for itself and God for us all," as we remember Canning said one hundred years ago. It is quite possible to befog oneself on this question — like that other question of state sovereignty where the debators became gassed with the abundance of their own eloquence. One feels like imitating the jury in "Alice in Wonderland" and writing "important-unimportant" against these hair-splitting orators and writers who obscure the real issue. The whole is not greater than its parts, and the parts do not relinquish individuality. We are none the less loyal Americans because we become international — in spite of Mr. Roosevelt, who said that to ask a man to love another country as well as his own was like asking him to love another woman as well as his wife.

The League of Nations does not ask us to love another country as well as our own. It asks us only to love it well enough to refrain from murdering it, and to love our own country enough to prevent loss of its young manhood by submitting all grievances to an impartial court.

There are many degrees of love existing without conflict. No one knows this better than women. Citizens are to be national and yet international, as a woman may be a devoted wife and still be a good mother. She may even remain a faithful daughter. She has even been known to be a trusted friend. For life is made up, not of one, but of many loyalties. And when we widen the circle of our loyalties, we do not rob other devotions but enrich them with the contributions that new experience brings. No one grows poorer through spiritual giving. Nationality and devotion to country will not suffer because we enlarge the base of these precious attributes — in spite of Mr. Roosevelt's intense Americanism. It is pleasant to note, in passing, that Mr. Roosevelt abandoned his opposition to a League of Nations — assumed for campaign purposes since he had declared himself in favor of a general league as far back as 1910 — and that he produced a plan of his own only a week or so before he died. National patriotism will not perish because its principles are to become inclusive, not exclusive. It will have only a wider foundation on which to spread its tender fronds.

And loyalty! What an opportunity for women to uphold a world league by dramatizing patriotism! How often did our patriotism of old become really visualized or vocal? Like religion, it was kept for special days. Like the uniforms of vete-

rans, it was laid away in moth balls and brought out with our flags and our national anthems — whose words nobody knew! When? Once a year, on Decoration Day, in parades by firemen and Grand Army men whose patriotism we honored by going to the country — if we could get there. Our own patriotism was in no way indigenous to our everyday life.

The League of Nations will give to true patriotism that stimulus that nothing else could give it — an appeal wider than the interest of self. Only unselfishness really grips and moves people. Only idealism may lift patriotism to that high plane of altruism where in reality it belongs.

Think of the parades and world pageants of the future staged by patriotic men and women! How strong an appeal may be made to our new-born loyalty when the flags of the world, the music of the world and the costumes of the world pass colorfully before us. Think of the artistic outlet, the imaginative outlet for thousands of our drab-minded children when the almost unused channel of masks and tableaux illustrating the development of peoples or of democratic international events shall be given to us by great artists, as the pageant of St. Louis was given by Mr. Percy Mackaye — a historic reflection that resulted in a new charter for the city.

It is impossible to speak of women and patriotism without calling to mind the last words of that

great woman patriot — Edith Cavell, the English woman who showed the world how calmly a Christian woman may die. Just before she went before the German firing squad to be shot, she gave the world this immortal interpretation of patriotism.

"Standing as I do in view of God and Eternity," she said, "I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness toward any one."

And following the line of these inspiring words, President Wilson has given us a beautiful phrase to show us how we may broaden the old restricting patriotism. "We must organize the friendship of the world" — surely a social task, and as surely a woman's opportunity and privilege.

Volumes have been written upon friendship and the qualifications of friendship. But no more sincere aspiration has been penned than the simple lines of Phillips Brooks, "I ask of my friend that he be one with me in character and in the high purposes of life."

For the first time in history the nations of the world became one in character and in the high purposes of life — the highest purpose that could unite nations: the desire to build a new world founded upon justice and upon the common conservation of the sacred principle of life. No higher enterprise of the human spirit is possible. Though it require years to accomplish, on such an altar the

social gifts of women should be laid with a spontaneous consecration of the best that is in them.

Every ray of friendship piercing the smoke of war, every gleam of light and understanding between nations in wartime, must be captured and retained in peace. The exchange of visits, of courtesies, of expressions of good-will must continue and be followed by other exchanges. We must have more scholarships, such as Cecil Rhodes made possible in the interest of the British Empire, that education may become international; the compulsory teaching of languages in our public schools that our American boys may be at home in other tongues; and countless heralds of democracies, call them anything but 'diplomats' — women as well as men — to promote understanding, now that Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse has shown how successful a woman emissary may be.

Finally, women must not only educate public opinion, they must not only dramatize peace, but also they must cultivate what Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has called "the international habit of mind." For women, whose lives are spent so largely working in a sphere of the personal, this attitude might be somewhat difficult had not the war paved the way. Every woman who knitted socks for soldiers in France, or rolled bandages for the men wounded in the Italian mountains, knows what it is to be internationally minded. For this state is not an academic attitude. It is not of

the head so much as of the heart. Its spirit was well illustrated by the words of a woman whom I heard on the train last summer. She was telling her companion of the valiant way in which the Italians had repelled the Austrians on the frontier.

"Do you know," she said, "I feel as if I never could call them Dagos again." I turned and looked at her. She was chewing gum and her hat was worn at an impossible angle. But around her head was the halo of the international spirit which recognizes the kinship of peoples; the spirit that over-leaps racial antagonism and obliterates the word alien as the world's agony over-leaped distance and proved there were no foreign shores.

The success of the draft of a league of free nations will depend largely upon one premise almost never mentioned, and, in the necessary economic and political discussions, perhaps inevitably overlooked. To women, I believe, will fall predominantly the duty of overcoming this obstacle. The success of an international instrument for preserving peace pre-supposes a new mental attitude toward war. Women, I believe, must help to create this attitude. And they must begin with themselves! They must overcome the inertia of the average feminine mind that declares that wars always have been and always will be. War is no more eternal than slavery was eternal, or concubinage, or cholera, or child widows in India are eternal. Wars will cease just as soon as the united

human understanding wills that they shall cease. Wars will cease just as soon as men and women say firmly, "All this premeditated deviltry of destruction must forever end," and then organize squarely for it to end. Wars no longer "occur" because one nation hates another nation. Modern wars "happen" because one man — a Bismarck, a Napoleon, a Wilhelm — sits with a group of men and plans that they shall happen. Modern war, therefore, is an intellectual crime to be overcome by intellectual means. The draft of the League of Nations may be made such an intellectual instrument. It offers to settle any intricate difficulty that human ambition or human deviltry may devise. War will be no longer necessary unless a nation arbitrarily chooses to oppose this instrument, this "union of common wills" and to invite the united nations to proceed against it.

To create a new attitude toward war in the face of a victory is not altogether easy. Many people, fundamentally opposed to force of arms, have emerged from a war fought to overthrow a feudal monarchy with its satellite of militarism, hating the sinner but disposed to adopt the sin. They see the fruits of military victory, and would perpetuate the medium of victory. They do not see the cost of victory. They overlook the stupendous price that civilization has paid that the world might be free, once for all, from the philosophy of the Prussian idea.

But women must not forget the cost of victory, the cost not alone to the world's national treasury, but to the storehouse of the human race. The debts of warring nations are staggering, but the bankruptcy of humanity is more staggering still. The tree of life has been cut back to the roots. A major proportion of the creative man-power of the world for years to come has been obliterated. Millions of youths swept blackly out of life, millions of men left crippled, crazed or mangled, millions of girls left without fitting fathers for their little children, and countless children born as no child should be born, of lust, the outrage to morality that follows in the wake of war's loosened, seething passions.

Women must not forget what war does to women and through women to the race, nor let the world forget it. In every war the honor of women has gone down like a pebble in the ocean. In this war, at first, there was an outcry at the spreading circle. Then it melted away in the swift approach of other war atrocities. That the honor of women must go in war was axiomatic. That war babies were a logical sequence of war was inevitable. Society was no more able to protect its women in 1914 than it had been in the middle ages. Instead, society met this stupendous immorality by a measure more radical, according to Mr. Arthur Gleason in *Inside the British Lines,* than any measures proposed by syndicalists or state socialists. The

British War Office and the Admiralty passed bills legitimatizing its illegitimate war children! And in this country, Mrs. Mary Lilly, one of the first women assemblymen, has wisely introduced a bill to legitimatize all war children born of American soldiers!

Women must create a new attitude toward war by refusing ever again to acquiesce in this evil — the desecration of motherhood and the pollution of the race at the fountain source. Emancipation counts for little if it does not create a body of public sentiment strong enough to restrain governments who would exact the same detrimental sacrifices from women in the day of their liberation as in the day of their race subjugation. Women must refuse to sanction the immorality of war.

That such a body of opinion with a strong sense of race consciousness and race responsibility did not exist among women in 1914 was an enigma to many men who had felt that the entrance of women into the arena of public affairs should purge the world of its most outstanding preventable evils. That the famous rebel women of England, for instance, could break windows, slash works of art, threaten monuments of antiquity, go to prison, indulge in hunger strikes and risk their lives for a paltry thing like a vote, but that these same women would put forth no effort to save their sons from frightfulness and their girls from shame; that they did not even register a historic

protest, either collectively or individually, against the crash of civilization, was inexplicable to certain logical, masculine minds. Mr. W. L. George, for instance, has written a bitter charge against "advanced" women in the *Atlantic Monthly*. In the world crisis, he claims, when women might have put forth their new organized power to check the world doom, they proved themselves still primitive, still barbaric. They reverted to type. They did not lead. They followed. And mankind as a whole became sucked into the abyss.

The same charge against women, in more dramatic form, has been made by the brilliant Austrian writer, Andreas Latzko, in his book *Men in War*, one of the few war books of artistic genius. An officer, a well-known composer, had been sent from the front to the hospital, a physical and mental wreck. His pretty young wife came to see him, but he shrank from her caresses. Heart-broken, she left wondering what had come between them. Then he broke loose. To a group of men who were discussing the worst feature of the war, this tortured man with writhing arms and twitching lips, exclaimed:

"You want to know what was the most awful thing?" he groaned, turning to the Philosopher, abruptly. "The disillusionment was the most awful thing — the going off. The war wasn't. The war is what it has to be. Did it surprise you to find out that war is horrible? The only surprising thing

was the going off. To find out that women are horrible — that was the surprising thing. That they can smile and throw roses, that they can give up their men, their children, the boys they had put to bed a thousand times and pulled the covers over a thousand times, and petted and brought up to be men. That was the surprise! That they gave us up — that they sent us — sent us. Because every one of them would have been ashamed to stand there without a hero. That was the great disillusionment. Do you think we should have gone if they had not sent us? . . . . No general could have made us go if the women hadn't allowed us to be stacked on trains, if they had screamed out that they would never look at us again if we turned murderers. Not a single man would have gone off if they had sworn never to give themselves to a man who has split open other men's skulls and shot and bayoneted human beings. Not one man, I tell you, would have gone. I didn't want to believe that they could stand it like that. 'They're only pretending,' I thought. 'They're just restraining themselves. But when the first whistle blows they'll begin to scream, and tear us out of the train, and rescue us.' Once they had the chance to protect us, but all they cared about was being in style — nothing else in the world, but being in style." This charge against women must not be forgotten — and never again be justified.

Perhaps nothing will help women to create a

new attitude toward war so much as letting in the searchlight of truth as to the present-day causes of war — causes of which we have already spoken. When the Spartan mother buckled on the armor of her lord and said "With your shield or on it," there was heroism in the act, for barbarians threatened civilization. In 1914, no barbarians threatened Germany. There was no nobility in her murderous assault on society, though for years Germany had lauded war as a moral issue. Germany declared war for reasons so grossly material that they had to be covered by a network of lies in order to whip battalions into battle. Germany desired more markets for her glut of goods, more outlets for her flow of accumulating capital, more colonies for raw materials, more 'spheres of influence' for that economic ascendency she was so rapidly attaining. But what soldiers would fight for markets, for the privilege of exploiting backward peoples! What patriot would lay down his life that Junkers might get a higher interest from cheap, Coolie labor? What Boche would shed his blood for iron ore for his Krupp industry! And so Germany camouflaged, and the 'kept Junker press' responded and perverted patriotism, prostituting idealism in the picture of a threatened fatherland. Even the Socialists marched to the front dazed but believing that Germany was engaged in a war of defence.

Frederick the Great said that if his soldiers

thought they would not be soldiers. If the mothers of soldiers think, and think straight, as to the economic causes of war and how they might be settled by other methods than warfare, the attitude toward war will change of itself and war will become universally outlawed. The World Court will make future war a disgrace. The spur of patriotism, the summons to defend home and fireside, may be applied, as of old. But underneath, imperial aggression will be recognized and condemned, since a League of Nations will have power to settle any economic difficulty the crafty brain of man may concoct.

And militarism? It is not possible for women to change the attitude toward war fundamentally until the attitude toward militarism changes, also. Perhaps the returning soldier will have more to do with changing this attitude than any one else. Not the officers. The man in the ranks. The man who has suffered ignominy and humiliation from petty tyrany. He knows how democratic militarism is. The countless boys sentenced to years of imprisonment for minor offences can testify to the autocracy of militarism. Thousands of youths, loyal and patriotic, are declaring that the next war will find them missing in China. They fought that other boys might never have to go and suffer as they suffered. It is up to mothers to see that no boy is ever again sent to the trenches. We have fought a great war to put down war and militarism, but

in reality what spirit has the war bred? In the strong places of the world we see a desire not to exterminate militarism but to transfer it, to pick the mote out of our neighbor's eye and place it, deliberately, in our own! When returning generals and politicians talk, as already they do talk, of getting "our young boys ready for the next war," mothers in every land should rise and say, "There is not going to be a next war. We forbid! You must settle your difficulties without the human ammunition which we are determined hereafter to protect."

When a democracy talks of conscription, you may begin to suspect it. When a democracy advocates universal military training, you may be sure that it is out for something it "hadn't oughter" have. It may be the desire to monopolize the trade of the world. It may be the wish to obtain economic privileges over rivals. It is not legitimate if it has to be defended at the point of the gun. I know that Switzerland with its gentle, home-made military training, where every man keeps his gun at home and constitutes a kind of ever-ready minute man is sure to be cited in opposition. But Switzerland is unique in its geographical situation. It was a small country surrounded by large imperialistic military countries — by frenzied bands of royal Jesse Jameses. Switzerland's real defence, however, was not its country-side militia, but its mountain ranges. If Germany had cared

to surmount these barriers, the Swiss army would have crumpled like paper, just as Belgium crumpled. There is no security against a dominant military power determined to overcome just as there is no such thing as making a modern house burglar proof. The only safety lies in community safety, in securing not one house, but all.

The League of Nations covenant is a community insurance against international maurauders. It is an insurance against political incendiaries and commercial second-story men. It is an organization of moral force to supercede military force that in the past backed up all the illicit interstate practises and ambitions of history. Military training does not belong to the new era of democratic, industrial development any more than the customs of feudalism belong to this period. It is a "hangover" of a period to which we should gladly say hail and farewell.

But the advantages of universal military training we hear argued! Women who once shrank from war and all that it implies, delicate, idealistic women, devoted mothers, many of them, have become enthusiastic supporters of military training, even in times of peace. How shall we account for this contradiction?

The anomaly, I believe, is easily explained. It is due to natural but confused and false logic. When the war broke out, society received a shock to learn that 70 per cent. of its youth was physi-

cally unfit to go to war. Even among the recruits accepted, it was a sorry, anaemic looking lot that in 1917 shambled off to the camps.

In six months these men returned, metamorphosed. Who can forget the thrill of pride felt when the first fruits of the training camps marched down Fifth Avenue in the snow storm of February 22, 1918? The pale-faced, flabby boys had become ruddy, erect, tingling with vitality and directed energy and health. Then came the confusion of thought. To military training was attributed a change which in reality was due to outdoor life, to regular hours, simple food (and for the first time, for many, plenty of it), clean ideals and collective discipline. The body had been respected, hardened, nourished, not coddled or neglected. War took over and developed the human product as peace had never developed it. Militarism was lauded as the royal road to manliness and health. The other thing forgotten was what bayonet practice did to the boy's mind.

Every one of these physical advantages must be held in the future. We must have all kinds of camps for boys with the right kind of discipline — not imported from Prussia — and outdoor life with nourishing food. We must have hygiene, prophylaxis and idealism taught and respected. But these camps must be for constructive, not destructive purposes. They must be part of great, organized land armies of the future. We must

have engineer corps and irrigation corps, and botanical and all kinds of scientific camps, experimenting and training boys out of doors to fit them physically and mentally for industrial citizenship. Every boy may pick out the camp of his heart's desire, and serve for one, two or three years. And if he has no special desire, psychological experts will place him where he may best serve. These camps will have the advantages of the Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus, and the Red Cross in peace as well as in war. They may have uniforms and bugles and promotions without the nonsense of military rank — everything except the heel clicking and the muskets. They must be great centers of practical idealism translated into forms of service, teaching men how to live for others as the military camps taught them so splendidly how to die for others. The only thing scrapped will be the guns. "It is difficult to teach idealism to a boy with a gun in his hand."

Women must never let governments forget that peoples were urged to fight this war, primarily to put down militarism. How it rolled like an oratorical theme through the sickening surge of battle! How it heartened the soldiers. How it sustained the industrial worker. "To put down militarism," peace-loving America united with stricken Europe, pouring out her blood and her treasure in a righteous war to end war.

Mothers of Israel must see that nations keep

their word to the peoples who loyally waged war for them. The people must not be betrayed.

The way to put down militarism is to put it down — and out. It is not to put it down and then hang it around our own necks, as the Indian chief hung his victim's dripping scalp at his belt.

Militarism should be as dead as Czarism, as Kaiserism is dead. All the attempt to revive what H. G. Wells calls that saluting, "marching tomfoolery" that went on unchecked for forty years, in the heart of Europe, should be nipped in the bud. The effort to re-establish universal military training under any new name or pretense whatever, especially in America, should be regarded as a subtle move toward imperialism — trade imperialism — and should be met by American women as an outrage to a democratic people and an irreconcilable barrier to the idealism of youth. We must make our men strong without teaching them to become assassins. If we can devise no other means of promoting health, we are indeed uncivilized since we have not the intelligence of the ancient Greeks.

And armaments? What is the American woman to say to the proposal to build the largest navy in the world?

The one justification for armies and navies with a League of Nations that functions is that they may do international service. It may be that America will have to accept responsibility in the Eastern mandataries and place her fleet at the dis-

posal of the League. High-minded people who cling to the principles of the army and navy through inheritance and tradition, and there are many, will still have an opportunity to uphold their ideals by placing their sons in the ranks. More honor, not less honor, will attach itself to a service that becomes devoted to the service of all.

A sincere step toward the reduction of armament, taken by all the great Powers, would do more to change the attitude of the public mind toward war and to awaken a genuine faith in the moral power of the League of Nations than any other one step.

Some one has said that women are not interested primarily in political reform. They are interested only in moral reform. Here then, is an opportunity for them to learn that they may use the political form for ethical purposes.

The League of Nations is the embodiment of a moral idea. It is an effort to standardize group ethics and erect a criterion of collective morality. It is an effort to make mass murder as punishable in the Court of the World as individual murder is punishable in the civil court. Its draft is an International Decalogue, given from the burning bush of war to place war where it belongs — in the ranks of preventable, organized crime.

Not only will the League of Nations make war disadvantageous, but also, by stripping it of false idealism, it will make warfare an ethical question

as it has never been made ethical before. War has been considered a necessary evil — if only it were waged for a high enough ideal. In the future, no ideal will justify war, for always there will be the higher way open to settle difficulties. By the decree of the League, it is true, a nation does not surrender its right to declare war. It simply promises to submit its case to the World Court and wait three months before beginning hostilities. It is almost impossible, however, to think of a case in which a dispassionate court would advise war. If a country should defy the decision of the Court it will register itself a moral outcast — as Germany became a moral outcast, even without a world court, in the Court of Public Opinion. The League of Nations will establish moral equivalents for war which no country will care to set aside.

Here again, women have a supreme opportunity to aid in the establishment of a Democratic League of Nations. They have, in fact a double chance. They have, first, the practical opportunity to use their new political power to uphold, through the ballot, the men who stand for a world league and to discard the men who do not; and they have also the ethical opportunity that the world has never denied them, to work for international morality. The League of Nations is to be founded upon law, to be sure. But it is to be law backed by moral force — as all law must be upheld by public sentiment, since the world is not to be saved by legalities

alone. No nation may be legislated into righteousness. It is to be saved by the will to be saved, springing from a common moral conscience. And this moral conscience must be supplied at least one-half, and it may be even two-thirds, by women. For practical morality, the world has always insisted, must be upheld primarily by women. The moral realm is the one realm where women have been allowed to hold unquestioned sway.

When enough women have grasped the fact that a League of Nations is a moral concept, designed to overcome evil and guarantee life, even before it is a political or an economic concept, the enthusiasm of women, I believe, will rally to give the ethical support to the covenant which it surely needs. The inherent instinct for race preservation and the imposed instinct for moral preservation will unite and blend into one.

When the churches, too, so largely maintained by women, awaken to the truth that the League of Nations is a moral question challenging their interest on ethical grounds alone, they too will become united banner-bearers of international righteousness. What an opportunity for a Christian renaissance! New checks upon national selfishness! New codes for industrial justice! New standards of the value of life! At last a unifying principle of Brotherhood, not a dream but a working reality! A great new gospel, a world-embracing propaganda to unite nations and renew man's trust in

God and man! Here we have the meeting of the old Hebraic law, "Thou shalt not kill," trying to overcome the law of the Jungle, and the new Messianic social gospel — "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is for women, creators of life and to-day socially vocal, politically responsible, to say who is our neighbor. It is for mothers, the world over, to unite to put an end to war by aiding governments to establish this beginning of the Christ ideal.

APPENDIX A.

THE FOURTEEN POINTS.

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest points consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal

weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to

France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

APPENDIX B.

THE PARIS COVENANT FOR A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Text of the Plan adopted by the Paris Peace Conference, April 28, 1919.

Preamble.

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security, by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as to actuual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, the high contracting parties agree to this covenant of the League of Nations.

Article I.

The original members of the League of Nations shall be those of the signatories which are named in the annex to this covenant and also such of

those other states named in the annex as shall accede without reservation to this covenant. Such accessions shall be effected by a declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other members of the League.

Any fully self-governing state, dominion or colony not named in the annex may become a member of the league if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the league in regard to its military and naval forces and armaments.

Any member of the league may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the league, provided that all its international obligations under this covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

ARTICLE II.

The action of the league under this covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

ARTICLE III.

The Assembly shall consist of representatives of the members of the league.

The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals, and from time to time as occasion may require, at the seat of the league, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

At meetings of the Assembly each member of the league shall have one vote, and may have not more than three representatives.

ARTICLE IV.

The council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, of the British Empire, of France, of Italy, and of Japan, together with representatives of four other members of the league. These four members of the league shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the representatives of the four members of the league first selected by the Assembly, representatives of ——— shall be members of the Council.

With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional members of the league, whose representatives shall always be members of the Council; the Council, with like approval, may increase the number of members of the league to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

The Council shall meet from time to time as

occasion may require, and at least once a year. at the seat of the league, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

Any member of the league not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that member of the league.

At meetings of the Council, each member of the league represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one representative.

Article V.

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant, or by the terms of this treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the league represented at the meeting.

All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or the Council, the appointment of committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the members of the league represented at the meeting.

The first meeting of the Assembly and the first

meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

Article VI.

The permanent Secretariat shall be established at the seat of the league. The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary General and such secretaries and staff as may be required.

The first Secretary General shall be the person named in the annex; thereafter the Secretary General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

The secretaries and the staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary General with the approval of the Council.

The Secretary General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Assembly and of the Council.

The expenses of the Secretariat shall be borne by the members of the league in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

Article VII.

The seat of the league is established at Geneva.

The Council may at any time decide that the seat of the league shall be established elsewhere.

All positions under or in connection with the league, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women.

Representatives of the members of the league

and officials of the league when engaged on the business of the league shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

The buildings and other property occupied by the league or its officers or by representatives attending its meetings shall be inviolable.

Article VIII.

The members of the league recognize that the maintenance of a peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each state, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

The members of the league agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those members of the league which are not able to manu-

facture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The members of the league undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military and naval programs and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.

ARTICLE IX.

A permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Article I and VIII and on military and naval questions generally.

ARTICLE X.

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE XI.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the Secretary General shall, on the

request of any member of the league, forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

Article XII.

The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council.

In any case under this article the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

Article XIII.

The members of the league agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration. Disputes as to the interpre-

tation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration. For the consideration of any such dispute the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

The members of the league agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered and that they will not resort to war against a member of the league which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

Article XIV.

The Council shall formulate and submit to the members of the league for adoption plans for the establishment of a permanent Court of International Justice. The court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

ARTICLE XV.

If there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration as above, the members of the league agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof. For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case, all the relevant facts and papers; and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavor to effect a settlement of any dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any member of the league represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts

of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party of the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly all the provisions of this article and of Article XII relating

to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and power of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the league represented on the Council and of a majority of the other members of the league, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

Article XVI.

Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Article XII, XIII or XIV, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the league or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute

to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

The members of the league agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking state, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the members of the league which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the league.

Any member of the league which has violated any covenant of the league may be declared to be no longer a member of the league by a vote of the Council concurred in by the representatives of all the other members of the league represented thereon.

ARTICLE XVII.

In the event of a dispute between a member of the league and a state which is not a member of the league, or between states not members of the league, the state or states not members of the league shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles XII to XVI inclusive shall be

applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given, the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

If a state so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a member of the league, the provisions of Article XVI shall be applicable as against the state taking such action.

If both parties to the dispute, when so invited, refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE XVIII.

Every convention or international engagement entered into henceforward by any member of the league shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

ARTICLE XIX.

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the league of

treaties which have become inapplicable, and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

Article XX.

The members of the league severally agree that this covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

In case members of the league shall, before becoming a member of the league, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this covenant, it shall be the duty of such member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

Article XXI.

Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.

Article XXII.

To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the states which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous

conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this covenant.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples be intrusted to advanced nations who, by reasons of their resources, their experience or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as mandataries on behalf of the league.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic condition and other similar circumstances.

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatary until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatary.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the mandatary must be

responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses, such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other members of the league.

There are territories, such as Southwest Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population or their small size or their remoteness from the centres of civilization or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the mandatary and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the mandatary as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population. In every case of mandate, the mandatary shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the mandatary shall, if not previously agreed upon by the members of the league, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

A permanent commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the mandataries and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

ARTICLE XXIII.

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the league (a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women and children both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organizations; (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control; (c) will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs; (d) will intrust the league with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest; (e) will make provision to secure and maintain the freedom of communication and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league. In this connection the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918

shall be in mind; (f) will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

Article XXIV.

There shall be placed under the direction of the league all international bureaus already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. All such international bureaus and all commissions for the regulation of matters of international interest hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the league.

In all matters of international interest which are regulated by general conventions but which are not placed under the control of international bureaus or commissions, the Secretariat of the league shall, subject to the consent of the Council and if desired by the parties, collect and distribute all relevant information, and shall render any other assistance which may be necessary or desirable.

The Council may include as part of the expenses of the Secretariat the expenses of any bureau or commission which is placed under the direction of the league.

Article XXV.

The members of the league agree to encourage and promote the establishment and co-operation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations having as purposes improvement of

health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

ARTICLE XXVI.

Amendments to this covenant will take effect when ratified by the members of the league whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the members of the league whose representatives compose the Assembly.

No such amendment shall bind any member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a member of the League.

ANNEX TO THE COVENANT.

One. Original members of the League of Nations.

Signatories of the Treaty of Peace:

United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, British Empire, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, China, Cuba, Czecho-Slovakia, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Serbia, Siam, Uruguay.

States invited to accede to the covenant:

Argentine Republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela.

Two. First Secretary General of the League of Nations: Sir Eric Drummond.

APPENDIX C.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM OF THE WOMAN'S PEACE PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE.

Why Our Next Congress is Important.

The Congress to which we elect representatives next fall will open its first session in December, 1919 (though very likely it will be called in extra session in March of that year). It will continue to sit until March, 1921. It is almost certain to be the Congress in session while the questions of the Peace Settlement are being discussed, for though peace negotiations may begin earlier, the fundamental world-wide readjustments involved will probably necessitate a conference extending over a long period of months.

Therefore, this next Congress is probably the most important one since the formation of the union. We must see that the men who compose it are equal to their responsibilities.

They will have a share in a task not unlike the task performed by the men who drew up our Federal Constitution. They will have to assist in

finding a way by which sovereign states can unite and live peaceably and prosperously together. This means a slow and patient progress of reconciling not only rival nations but rival groups within the nations.

What the Woman's Peace Party of New York Asks of the Candidates for the Next Congress.

"As a candidate for the Congress which will be in session while the problems incident to the settlement of the war are before the world we ask you to indorse the following proposals:

A democratic league of all nations, based upon: Free seas — Free markets — Universal disarmament — The right of peoples to determine their own destiny.

The development of an international parliament and tribunal as the governing bodies of such a league.

Daylight diplomacy, with democratic control of foreign policy.

Legislation whereby American delegates to the end-of-the-war conference shall be elected directly by the people.

Furthermore, that America's championship of the principle of reduced armaments may appeal to the rest of the world as disinterested and sincere, we ask you to oppose legislation committing this

country to the adoption of universal compulsory military training."

A League of Nations.

"Of all the war aims, none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war. Whoever triumphs the world will have lost, unless some effective method of preventing war can be found. . . . The Conference demands. . . that it should be an essential condition of the Treaty of Peace itself that there should be forthwith established a supernational authority, or League of Nations, which should not only be adhered to by all the present belligerents, but which every other independent sovereign State in the world should be pressed to join; the immediate establishment by such a League of Nations not only of an International High Court for the settlement of all disputes between States that are of justiciable nature, but also of appropriate machinery for prompt and effective mediation between States in issues that are not justiciable; the formation of an International Legislature in which the representatives of every civilized State would have their allotted share; the gradual development, as far as may prove to be possible, of International legislation agreed to by and definitely binding upon the several States; and for a solemn agreement and pledge by all States that every issue between any two or

more of them shall be submitted for settlement as aforesaid, and that they will all make common cause against any State which fails to adhere to this agreement." — *British Labor Party. Program prepared by the Executive Committee for consideration by the Inter-Allied Socialist Conference, London, August,* 1917.

Most of the Governments have expressed agreement that after the war an organization of the nations in the interest of future peace is desirable.

It makes a big difference what kind of league is formed. If it is so organized as to exclude any nations, it will not insure peace. The "outlaw" nations will always stir up sedition and force or bribe other states to leave the league and join them.

If it is simply a court for hearing and judging grievances, it will not insure peace. There must, of course, be a judicial department; but there must be also power to pass laws and put them into effect. There must be, in other words, an international parliament or congress.

In this parliament, representation must be on the most democratic basis possible. The rights of small nations must be safeguarded. We cannot hope that a League of Nations will last if we admit the right of one nation to hold in subjection a weaker people against its will. The opportunities for friction are obvious and might lead to the formation of rival groups of great powers based

on whether or not they championed the cause of the discontented nationality. Minorities within the respective countries must be protected by some sort of proportional representation in the world legislative body.

Why a League of Nations Must Be Based On Free Markets and Free Seas.

The men who framed our Constitution knew something about the difficulties confronting those who would organize a group of sovereign states into a lasting union. In the beginning we were a league of thirteen independent republics joined in a loose federation which left to each State the right to regulate its commerce as it saw fit. This fact nearly destroyed the league. The States, though fresh from a conflict in which they had fought side by side for a common cause, were jealous of each other and afraid of each other, so much so that one Virginia statesman "considered it problematical whether it would not be better to encourage the British than the Eastern (New England) marine." And the state of Connecticut put a higher duty on goods imported from Massachusetts than on goods imported from England.

New York also erected tariff barriers against her neighbors. New York City in those days got her food from the Dutch farms in Jersey. Early in the morning of every market day the Hudson was

dotted with little boats loaded to the water's edge with butter and cheese, turnips and carrots, and other vegetables and fruits. Her fuel came from Connecticut, and every week vessels brought hundreds of cords of firewood into her harbor. But one day the New York State Legislature passed a law decreeing that every boat from New Jersey of more than twelve tons should henceforth be entered and cleared at the Custom House in the same manner as packets that came from London or any other foreign port. Similar restrictions were placed on boats from Connecticut. The rate of dockage was raised, and small sloops were forced to pay an entrance fee. This act angered Connecticut and New Jersey and they at once resorted to reprisals, which still further jeopardized cordial relations.

This was the sort of thing Washington had in mind when he said, "There are combustibles in every state which a spark might set fire to."

States without harbors had to pay heavy duties to States more fortunately located. New York, in control of the port through which goods had to pass on the way to New Jersey, put a tax on Jersey importations. Philadelphia, the only other port accessible to Jersey, did likewise. James Madison said that "New Jersey, placed between Philadelphia and New York, was like a cask tapped at both ends."

Feeling in New Jersey ran so high against New

York that the Legislature finally served notice on Congress that it would not pay its share in support of the general government unless the government did something to restrict the high-handed commercial practises of New York. The resolution amounted to a declaration of independence and Congress was so alarmed that a deputation was sent to reason with the Jersey legislature, which was only appeased by an opportunity to send delegates to a general convention "to consider how far a uniform system in their commercial regulations and other important matters might be necessary to the common interest and permanent harmony of the several states."

We may as well learn something from this experience. A league of sovereign states, if it is to last, must assign to the central governing body the power to equalize commercial opportunities. There must be an agreement whereby the markets of the world and the highways of commerce, the rivers and harbors and railroads and canals and straits and seas shall be open as freely to one country as to another.

Access to the Raw Materials of the World Must Be Free.

It is especially important to remove all barriers which limit access to the raw materials of the world. It is probable that the determination of the

German Government to hold Lorraine would be less bitter were she assured free access to the rich iron mines of the country. Having been driven by French financiers from the iron mines of Morocco, the iron of Lorraine is of prime importance to her industries.

"Free access" means simply that all prospective customers are given the same terms — that no one, no matter what his country, is forced to trade under a special handicap. It should be as easy for a citizen of Germany to buy iron in France as it is for a citizen of New York to buy iron in Pennsylvania.

Markets Must Be Open to Capital as Well as to Goods.

Not only must there be free markets for goods; markets must also be free to capital. For under our modern system the rivalry for opportunities to invest captital is far more bitter than the rivalry for markets for goods. The weak and backward countries are the fields sought by foreign investors. By forced loans to the rulers they secure concessions in mines, railroads, public works, etc., which bring in a bigger profit than investments at home on account of the possibility of exploiting labor in these countries and of securing a monopoly of the market through the backing of the home Government. For in this competition in foreign invest-

ments the rivals, unlike other traders, are backed by their respective Governments, so that what was originally a rivalry between financial groups becomes a rivalry between nations.

How French Financiers Used Their Government to Force Out Competitors in Morocco.

In 1890 Morocco and Germany made an agreement by which Germany was given the same trading and commercial rights as those enjoyed by "the most favored nations." As a result much German capital went into the country. In 1903 English financiers agreed to recognize French claims as paramount in Morocco. They did this in return for recognition of their exclusive rights in Egypt, and they used the British Government to put through a secret agreement whereby the support of Great Britain was promised whenever the French financiers should find it expedient to force the French Government to occupy the country they wanted to exploit. French financiers immediately set to work to prepare the way for the political subjection of Morocco, which would insure them a monopoly on investments in that country.

The extravagant tastes of the young Sultan were exploited. He was encouraged to borrow money from French, Spanish and British syndicates. Then, finally, he was induced to put himself under

obligation to France alone by borrowing enough money of French bankers to pay off all his other debts. The Sultan now became the slave of his French creditors. The loan was only the entering wedge.

In 1907 a Frenchman was murdered in Morocco. The French financiers made this incident serve the Government as an excuse for invading Morocco and occupying one of the frontier towns. Other casualities followed in clashes between natives and employees of the French syndicates, and France brought in more troops and bombarded more towns. Finally, in 1910, French troops occupied the capital. Thereupon the French financiers used the newspapers they controlled to inflame the minds of the public in order that the occupation might be justified. Much ink was spilled in the familiar propaganda explaining why a strong nation must subjugate a weak one — with special emphasis on the danger to French women and children in Morocco.

Thus French investors got control of the Morocco market. The door opened to German investors by Morocco in 1890 was slammed in their faces, and what was originally a struggle between the investing groups of Germany and France came very close to a war between the two nations.

Why We Must Insist on the "Open Door" in All Colonies.

Colonies are sources of raw material. They are also great potential markets for both capital and goods. It has been a pretty general practise for the "mother country" to create a system of preferential tariffs favoring trade with her own citizens and tending to shut out competitors from other countries. Also in granting concessions the preference has gone to citizens of the "mother country." "Spheres of influence," which is the name given before the country's political subjection has been openly acknowledged, are still more rigidly limited in favor of the holding country. Therefore the commercial and military rivalry which brought on the war centered in the rivalry for colonies and "spheres of influence." By insisting on "the open door" in colonies we remove the advantage which makes colonies desirable, and strike at a root cause of war.

Why Foreign Investors Demand Huge Armaments.

The French financiers would not have been able to put their competitors out of Morocco had their Government not had the backing of the British Government. The French Government alone would not have risked incurring a war with the Government of the German investors.

The bargaining strength of the competing exporters of capital is measured by the military and

naval strength of their respective governments.

"If we were to take the sum by which British and German armaments have increased in the present century, it would be possible to allocate the increase, roughly, somewhat as follows: 50% or less for the settlement of the question, "Who shall exploit Morocco?"; 25% or more for the privilege of building a railway to Bagdad and beyond it; 25% or more for the future eventualities which remain unsettled — the fate of the Portuguese colonies in Africa, and the destinies of China." (H. N. Brailsford, "The War of Steel and Gold," published May, 1914).

A League of Nations which is to last must have control over all foreign investments. Competition between exporters of capital, like the competition between exporters of goods, must rest on the bargaining power of the traders concerned and not on any artificial support lent by Government backing. An International Commerce Commission somewhat analogous to our Interstate Commerce Commission may be the solution of this problem.

WHY WE STAND FOR UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT.

"Whoever triumphs the world will have lost, unless some effective method of preventing war can be found. As a means to this end the conference relies very largely. . . on such concerted action as may be possible for the common limitation of the costly armaments by which all the

peoples are burdened, and upon the entire abolition of profit-making armament firms, whose pecuniary interest lies always in war scares and rivalry in preparation for war." — *Program Executive Committee of the British Labor Party, August,* 1917.

Of course, disarmament must come as the result of mutual agreement among the nations. But nations which plan to live peaceably together should be forbidden private armaments for the same reason that citizens are forbidden to carry arms. Weapons are too handy in case of a quarrel. We are principally concerned in removing all cause for quarreling. Then armament will at once be seen as an unnecessary burden.

Where Disarmament Worked.

The whole business of rivalry in armaments creates an atmosphere of suspicion and fear. Can you imagine how different our feeling toward Canada would be, how "preparedness campaigns" would thrive if the borderline between us were heavily fortified and the Great Lakes were patrolled by gun-boats? It was like that for about thirty years after the war with England. Every time England built a gun-boat and launched it in Lake Erie, we did the same. Until at last the United States saw that this was very foolish and we went to the English and said: "If you will stop building gun-boats on the Great Lakes, we will." England agreed, the boats they already had

there were thrown on the scrap heap, and since 1828 there have been 3,000 miles of unfortified frontier between Canada and the United States. Disarmament will not be such an easy matter now as it was then, for powerful groups of financiers find it profitable to control and stimulate the business. As in the case of Morocco, the government which is strongest either because of its own armament or that of its allies, is most successful in winning monopolies for its investors. Hence one reason for the part played by financiers in the speeding up of armament. But the need for extravagant armament will largely disappear when we have arranged some sort of international control over commercial and financial rivalries.

Why the First Step in Disarmament Must Be Government Ownership of Munitions Plants.

But not only do heavy armaments benefit those investing abroad. Every man who has large holdings in steel and powder is interested to see to it that the Government buys heavily and at top prices. The investors who control the armament industries in the various countries have made an agreement whereby the price for armor plate all over the world is set at a figure insuring an enormous profit to the "ring." The voting of huge sums to be spent on armament is artificially stimulated either

by "war scares" or by reports as to the enormous increases voted by rival nations.

The following incident of an artificial "war scare" is told in "Why War" (By Frederic C. Howe):

"The German Arms and Munitions Factories, an organization second only to Krupp, wrote to its agent in Paris a year or two ago: 'Get an article into one of the most widely read French newspaper — the Figaro if possible — to the following effect: 'The French Ministry of War has decided to accelerate considerably the provision of new pattern machine guns, and to order double the quantity at first intended.' The news was intended for German consumption. Confronted with such a news item, the combine reasoned, the Reichstag would readily agree to the purchase of new machine guns for Germany.

"This and similar scandals were exposed by Doctor Liebknecht in the Reichstag, and published in the Socialist *Vorwaerts.*"

Why Compulsory Military Training and Service Must Not Be Adopted as a Permanent Policy.

"There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained. The statesmen of

the world must plan for peace and nations must adjust and accommodate their policy to it as they have planned for war and made ready for pitiless conquest and rivalry.

"The question of armaments, whether on land or sea, is the most determined and intensely practical question connected with the future fortunes of nations and mankind." — *President Woodrow Wilson, January 22,* 1917.

The announced policy of all the Powers is the reduction of armament at the end of the war. It would be counter to the efforts of important groups everywhere if the United States should choose this time to enlarge her military establishment on an unprecedented scale. In fact, this action on the part of the freshest and most vigorous of the belligerents might overthrow the hope of the world — that competition in armament shall come to an end.

It has been argued that the policy of compulsory military training for boys under 21 should be tried out for the duration of the war. This proposal was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 36 to 26 on March 29, 1918. Even supporters of compulsory training as a permanent policy urged that at this time it would be a mistake to take sufficient officers from active service to give the required training.

"The Department has not sought, and does not now seek legislation on the subject (universal

military training) chiefly for the reason that the formation of a permanent military policy will inevitably be affected by the arrangement consequent upon the termination of the present war. Civilized men must hope that the future has in store relief from the burden of armaments, and the destruction and waste of war." — *Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, in his Annual Report to the War Department, December,* 1917.

Why Daylight Diplomacy and Democratic Control of Foreign Policy Are Necessary to Lasting Peace.

"Publicity will restore the elementary honesty in international relations. It will also put an end to the possibility, for the press, placed at the service of the great parasitical industrial and commercial interests, to corrupt public opinion and the sentiment of the masses, by an inspired publicity." — *Proclamation issued by three of the most important Labor and Socialists Groups in Italy.* (*From N. Y. Evening Post, July* 17, 1917.)

President Wilson puts as the first requisite for a lasting peace, "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

Secret diplomacy is one of the tools of those

interested in foreign investment, as important for them as big armaments.

The agreement which the English Government made with the French Government in 1903 to support the claims of her investors in Morocco was a secret agreement. Is it likely that the people would have consented to an arrangement whereby the nation might be plunged into war in order that French investors might have an exclusive market for their capital?

This is why the people should have full knowledge of all agreements and full control over foreign affairs.

Do the People Know Enough to Control Foreign Affairs?

Sometimes it is said that the people are too ignorant to meddle with foreign affairs. It is doubtful whether ignorance could do any worse for us than the intrigues of carefully instructed diplomats have done.

For a sample of "ignorance" versus "skill" in handling international problems, compare the peoples' solution of some of the problems of the present conflict with the solution offered by diplomats.

The Question of Asia Minor.
Diplomatic Solution.

The following memorandum of a secret agreement between England and Russia (one of those

recently made public in Petrograd), shows how allied statesmen proposed to deal with the delicate problem of how to save Asia Minor from "the blasting tyranny of the Turk."

"As a result of negotiations taking place in the Spring of 1916 in London and Petrograd, the British, French and Russian governments came to an agreement with regard to future distribution of their zones of influence and territorial acquisitions in Asiatic Turkey, and also with regard to organization within the limits of Arabia of an independent Arabian government or Confederation of Arabian governments.

"In general this agreement is substantially as follows:

"Russia acquires regions of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, Bitlis, and also the territory of South Kurdestan, along the line of Muscha Sert Ibn Omar — Amali Amalia, Persian boundary. The furthest point of Russian acquisition on the shore of the Black Sea is to be a point west of Trebizond, subject to future determination.

"France is to receive the coast strip of Syria, Addansk District and territory bounded on the south by a line running, Ajutab-Mardin to the future Russian boundary and on the north by a line Ala-Daga — Kosanyaak-Daga — Ildiz-Daga — Zara — Ogim — Kharput.

"Great Britain acquires southern part of Meso-

potamia with Bagdad and reserves for herself in Syria the ports of Harpha and Akka.

"By agreement between France and England the territory in the zones between French and English territories shall be formed into a confederation of Arabian governments, or an independent Arabian government, the zones of influence over which is herewith defined.

"Alexandro is declared a free port.

"With the aim of conserving the religious interests of the allied powers, Palestine with the sacred places is to be separated from Turkish territory and is to be subject to a special regime by agreement between Russia, France and England.

"As a general condition, the contracting powers mutually obligate themselves to recognize the respective concessions and prerogatives existing prior to the war in the territories acquired by them.

"They agree to assume a proportionate share of the Ottoman debt equivalent to their respective acquisitions."

People's Solution.

Here is the proposal which was first put forward by the British Labor Party, and which has since been endorsed in substance by the Inter-Allied Conference of Socialists and Labor Parties.

"The Conference realizes that the whole civilized world condemns the handing back to the universally execrated rule of the Turkish Government any

subject people which has once been freed from it. Thus, whatever may be proposed with regard to Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia, they cannot be restored to the tyranny of the Sultan and his Pashas. The Conference disclaims all sympathy with the Imperialist aims of governments and capitalists, who would make of these and other territories now dominated by the Turkish hordes merely instruments either of exploitation or militarism. If in these territories it is impracticable to leave it to the people to settle their own destinies the Conference suggests that they should be dealt with in the same way as the Colonies of Tropical Africa, and placed for administration in the hands of a Commission acting under the Supernational Authority or League of Nations. The Conference further suggests that the peace of the world requires that Constantinople should be made a free port, permanently neutralized and placed (together with both shores of the Dardanelles and possibly some or all of Asia-Minor) under the same impartial administration."

To which group would you rather trust the peace of the world — to the group which parcels out conquered populations like so much booty, and hands to a single nation the prize for which her rival is fighting, or to the group which places the whole field of disputed territory under international control?

Why There Must Be Peoples' Representatives at the Peace Settlement.

Always before when peace was made, the diplomats have made it. And they have never succeeded in making a peace that did not have in it the seeds of the next war. They have nothing better to offer now. Read the secret bargains they have made among themselves.

Seeds of Future War Between Austria and Italy.

Article VII of the secret agreement by which the Adriatic was to be made an Italian lake and which was the price of Italy's entrance into the war:

"On receiving Trentino and Istria in accordance with Article IV, of Dalmatia and the Adriatic islands in accordance with Article V, and the Bay of Vallon, Italy is obligated, in the event of the formation in Albania of a small autonomous neutralized state, not to oppose the possible desire of France, Great Britain, and Russia to redistribute among Montenegro, Servia, and Greece of the northern and southern districts of Albania. Italy shall have the right to conduct the foreign relations of 'Albania.'"

Seeds of Future War Between France and Germany.

A note from the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs to the French Ambassador at Petrograd, dated February 1, 1917, conveys Russia's agreement to the demands which French diplomats intended to include among the terms of peace and which involved the annexation of German territory outside the boundaries of Alsace. These terms cover: "1. Alsace and Lorraine to be returned to France.

"2. The boundaries will be extended at least to the limits of the former principality of Lorraine, and will be fixed under the direction of the French Government. At the same time strategic demands must be taken into consideration, so as to include within the French territory the whole of the industrial coal basin of the Valley of the Saar.

"3. Other territories located on the left bank of the Rhine, and not included in the composition of the German Empire, will be completely separated from Germany and shall be freed from all political and economic dependence on her.

"4. The territory on the left bank of the Rhine not included in the composition of French territory, shall form an autonomous and neutral government, and shall be occupied by French armies until such time as the enemy governments completely fulfill all the conditions and guarantees mentioned in the treaty of peace."

Seeds of Future War Between England and Germany.

The secret agreement by which Bagdad, the goal of German ambitions, was to go to England has already been quoted. Here is an agreement by which, in return for Constantinople and the Straits, Russia allowed England to include within her sphere of influence the Persian neutral zone created when Persia was virtually partitioned between Russia and England in 1907. This further insured British monopoly of the trade routes to India.

The agreement occurs in a secret telegram from the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Ambassador in London sent in March, 1915: "The Imperial Government confirms its agreement to the inclusion in the sphere of English influence of the neutral zone of Persia. It, however, deems it just to state that the regions constituting the cities of Ispahan and Gezda, forming with the latter one complete whole, shall be confirmed to Russia, because of the Russian interests established there.

"The neutral zone now cuts in a wedge-like shape between the boundaries of Russian and Afghanistan and comes close to the Russian boundary near Zulphagar. Because of that, it will be necessary to place part of that wedge within the Russian sphere of influence.

"Of material importance for the Imperial Government is the question of the building of rail-

roads in the neutral zone, which question calls for further friendly elucidation. In the future the Imperial Government expects recognition in it of full freedom of action in the sphere of influence allotted to it, with the reservation for it specially, or prior right of development with such sphere for its financial and economic enterprises."

The secret treaties of the Central Powers have not yet been given to the world. Doubtless a revolution in Germany would disclose the same insidious bargaining, without regard for the will of the peoples anywhere.

This sort of bargaining means new wars. That is why the people are demanding a voice in the settlement.

Delegates from the Socialist and Labor Parties of England, France, Italy, Belgium, Portugal, Roumania, and South Africa, meeting in London, February 20-23 1918, "Passed a resolution to convene an international Socialist conference to sit concurrently with the official Peace Conference, and also demanded that at least one Socialist should be included by every nation in the official delegation at the Peace Conference." (*New York Times,* February, 24, 1918.)

The International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace (of which the Woman's Peace Party is the American section) has made arrangements to convene in the same place and at the same time as the conference of the Powers which shall

frame the terms of the peace settlement after the war for the purpose of presenting practical proposals to that Conference.

But these parallel conferences, useful though they will be toward molding public opinion, are not at all the same thing as actual people's representatives at the Peace Conference. The principle of democratic representation has been voiced often, but few practical methods have been outlined. Norman Angell, however, in the *New Republic* of August 11, 1917, has made an interesting suggestion of a Peace Conference, to be made up of two houses, the smaller one to be composed of delegates of the Governments which are involved in the settlement, and the larger house to be made up of Peoples' delegates. To the Governments' delegates, according to Mr. Angell's plan, would fall the function of drafting and presenting proposals; but the People's delegates would have the power of amending, approving or rejecting their proposals. The selection of Peoples' delegates which Mr. Angell proposes is based on the number of representatives of each political party in the home Congresses.

But this plan would fall hard on a country like the United States, where the "minority opinion" has such scant representation in Congress.

An even more democratic method of representation must be worked out if the voice of the people is to be heard at the great Peace Conference.